

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 6848. A bill for the relief of Sharon Elaine Frankovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska:

H. R. 6849. A bill to provide for the reinstatement of William A. Burkett as a senior special agent, United States Treasury; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DEANE:

H. R. 6850. A bill for the relief of Martha Bridges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 6851. A bill for the relief of Salomon Salti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 6852. A bill for the relief of William H. Marnon, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAIL:

H. R. 6853. A bill for the relief of David Hanan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 29, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the supreme source of all wisdom and strength, we are again turning unto Thee in prayer, compelled by our needs.

In these tangled and confused times there are so many problems to solve and so much that is basically and shamefully wrong.

Show us which of our proposals for a strong and adequate national defense are most reasonable and equitable and practical and whether they are in accordance with Thy divine will.

May we have the courage to search and reach out for those ways and means that are righteous and just and for the welfare of all mankind and for Thy glory.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1851) entitled "An act to assist in preventing aliens from entering or remaining in the United States illegally"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. KILGORE, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. JENNER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. GARY, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 6854) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1450), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered printed.

Mr. CANFIELD reserved all points of order.

APPROPRIATION FOR MOTOR CARRIER CLAIMS COMMISSION, 1952

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 396, making an appropriation for the Motor Carrier Claims Commission for the fiscal year 1952.

The Clerk read the title of the House joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the House joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, the following sum:

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

MOTOR CARRIER CLAIMS COMMISSION

Salaries and expenses

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, Motor Carrier Claims Commission," \$52,000: *Provided*, That said appropriation shall remain available until December 31, 1952, and the limitation on the amount available for personal services as set forth under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952, is repealed.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the chairman of my subcommittee whether it is his intention to state briefly the reason this bill is brought up now.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes. Mr. Speaker, this is an item that needs immediate consideration. The Commission has been without sufficient funds now for some 3 or 4 weeks. We have had before the committee a budget estimate of

\$70,000 and the committee, after careful consideration of it, removed some of the limitations that had heretofore been put on the Commission and we also reduced the estimate by \$18,000. The committee had hoped and wished and urged that this rather small Commission would wind up its affairs by June 30 of the present fiscal year, but by some mishap they have not been able to do so. However, they promised that they will make every effort and they, in conjunction with the Department of Justice, now tell us that it is their best judgment that they can wind up by the 31st of December, 1952.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. The reason why the Commission has not been able to complete its work is because a test case was taken to the Supreme Court, and that was just recently filed.

Mr. THOMAS. That is one of the reasons, among others.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, in addition to the reason given by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I think my chairman should call attention to the fact that this came out of the subcommittee and also out of the full committee with a unanimous vote in each instance.

Mr. THOMAS. That is right.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 12]

Abbt	Dollinger	James
Allen, Ill.	Durham	Javits
Anfuso	Eberharter	Johnson
Armstrong	Ellsworth	Jonas
Bakewell	Fallon	Kearns
Bates, Ky.	Feighan	King, Calif.
Bender	Fine	Klein
Blatnik	Fugate	Lanham
Boykin	Fulton	Larcade
Bray	Garmatz	Latham
Buchanan	Gore	McCulloch
Buckley	Granahan	McGrath
Burton	Green	McIntire
Camp	Hall	Marshall
Case	Edwin Arthur	Martin, Mass.
Celler	Hall	Mason
Chatham	Leonard W.	Morgan
Chenoweth	Hardy	Morrison, La.
Chiperfield	Harrison, Nebr.	Multer
Chudoff	Hart	Murphy
Clemente	Hébert	Murray, Wis.
Combs	Heffernan	Nicholson
Cooley	Heller	O'Konski
Corbett	Herter	O'Neill
Coudert	Hess	Osmer
Cox	Hill	O'Toole
Dempsey	Hoffman, Ill.	Potter
Dingell	Jackson, Calif.	Powell

Prouty	St. George	Vall
Rains	Scott, Hardie	Velde
Redden	Secrest	Vursell
Rhodes	Sheehan	Weichel
Richards	Shelley	Wickersham
Rogers, Colo.	Sittler	Widnall
Rogers, Tex.	Staggers	Wilson, Tex.
Rooney	Stanley	Wilcott
Roosevelt	Stockman	Wood, Ga.
Sabath	Taylor	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 321 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING CORPS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5904) to provide for the administration and discipline of the National Security Training Corps, and for other purposes.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order, may I ask the chairman, if we could extend general debate for 1 hour since there are so many requests? It is now 12:35, and if we could run until 5 o'clock, at least 4:45, I could take care of every urgent request over here.

Mr. VINSON. I regret to say to the gentleman from Missouri that the time on this side has been allotted, and I advised the Members that that was the end of the time, and I doubt whether they could be brought here. For that reason I ask the gentleman not to insist upon it.

Mr. SHORT. I shall not insist because our chairman has been most considerate and kind throughout all the hearings on this bill, and also in the debate.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5904, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] had 1 hour and 44 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] had 1 hour and 38 minutes remaining.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, as I listened to the debate on this bill and the arguments of the opponents, my mind went back to 1939, 1940, and 1941, when the same arguments were then made against legislation pending in this House to prepare our country for defense in case of attack by Hitler-Germany and its allies. Every bill which later proved vital to the winning of World War II was passed in this body by a margin of from 1 to 21 votes. I re-

member the bill to extend selective service, which came up in this branch in September 1941. I lived 200 years in a period of 30 minutes while the roll call was on. I was leader of the House then as I am now. I had three votes in reserve, on active pairs, and if there was a tie, the vote of the Speaker. That was what I was operating on, on a bill that we know now concerned the very vital interest of our country.

I can remember the arguments made then by those who are here today and who were here then and who opposed that bill, that we were warmongers. "Who are we going to fight?" they said, and this 3 months before Pearl Harbor happened.

I have often thought that if that bill had been defeated, instead of winning by one vote, and if as a result of the failure of that bill to pass our country had been seriously harmed, what would have been the conscience of those who voted against the bill? What would have been the conscience of an American who had voted against that bill and defeated it, if it had been defeated then instead of passing by one vote? Because not involved is the interest of an individual, involved is the national interest of the United States. That is what was involved then and that is what is involved now.

Those of us who recognize that imminent danger confronted our country and who had the courage to assume our responsibility were attacked, as I said, and vilified. We well know that most of those who served then in the House and who opposed defense legislation at that time are opposing this bill now. They have not learned anything from the dreadful experiences of World War II. They could see no danger from Hitler then. They opposed then, and they oppose now.

Following the line of least resistance or political opportunism is not the course that will save a country, and in this case our country, and save the civilization of which our country and each and every one of us is a part. Appealing to the hopes and emotions of a people rather than to reason and the realities of the world situation is a somewhat easy political course to take, but is it the safe course in the national interest of our country? That is the real issue.

The main issue involved in this bill is, "Is the passage of this bill in the national interest of our country? In the light of the existing world conditions, is its passage necessary or reasonably necessary for the probable future defense of our country?"

No one can look ahead and say definitely what is going to happen, but we can tell what the situation is now. We know who the potential enemy is. We could not look ahead in September 1941, but there were those of us who realized that imminent danger confronted our country and that something had to be done, and we had to vote on the side of strength rather than the side of weakness. Those of us who are Members of this body and of the United States Senate must remember that we are charged with direct responsibility for the preser-

vation of our country. That duty rests squarely and directly upon our shoulders, 435 Members of the House and 96 Members of the Senate, not as Democrats or as Republicans but as Americans; not as individuals thinking primarily of the next election but as Members and Americans thinking of the years ahead and of the next generation. The fact is that we are Members of the Congress. We cannot dispute that fact. You and I are Members of the Congress, and by our election to this body, we are charged with the duty of preserving our country. It is our responsibility to preserve the inheritance we have received from past generations of Americans. We must preserve that inheritance not only for ourselves, but for future generations of our descendants. We must remember that the law of self-preservation applies to nations as well as to individuals. Is there any Member who will deny that a grave emergency exists? Is there any Member who feels that the danger facing our country is such that we should not develop our maximum strength to deter war, if that is possible, and, second, in the event of another world conflict so that we will win?

Is there any rational-minded Member who will challenge the statement that the present emergency is due to the Soviet Union and the conspiracy of international communism to dominate the world, and to enslave all peoples?

Is there any Member who will deny that we have been thrown into the situation and that through necessity and in our own national interest we should develop our strength not only for today, but for some years in the future?

Is there any Member who will challenge the fact that we are not living in a dream world, but in a disturbed world as a result of the plot of international communism, and that we should, and if we assume our congressional responsibilities, we must legislate in accordance with the realities of the world as they exist today? We cannot afford to take the chance of voting on the side of weakness.

As a Member of the Congress, with the direct responsibility on my shoulders, it is my duty to vote on the side of strength and not on the side of weakness. I have that direct responsibility on my shoulders. I am not back in Boston with the responsibility of an American citizen electing somebody else to assume his responsibility here in this representative body. No, I am here as that duly elected representative, and I have that direct responsibility. So have 434 other Members of this body, and 96 Members of the other body. As a Member of the Congress, with that direct responsibility resting upon me, I consider it my duty to vote on the side of strength and not on the side of weakness; to resolve any doubt in my mind on the side of strength, and not on the side of weakness.

Mr. Chairman, just as there were those who a decade or more ago took the position that no danger confronted our country, so are there such persons today. As they played with fire then, so are they now. But, Mr. Chairman, so far as

I am concerned, I am going to vote on the side of strength and security. No matter what may happen in the future—no matter what may happen on this bill in this branch of the Congress, I can then live with my conscience knowing that so far as I could, I did everything to protect and preserve my country.

Let me remind you that only 11 years ago there were Members of this body, some of whom are Members today, who charged that those who voted for defense legislation were "warmongers," and that Hitler's Germany and imperialistic Japan had no designs on our country. They claimed that we would not become involved in the war, which later developed into World War II. No one can deny that Pearl Harbor actually took place.

Mr. Chairman, the pending bill is a defense measure. We are considering it under conditions of serious world danger, and under conditions of grave emergency to the country. The emergency is great. This fact must be borne in mind—that we are considering this bill not during a period of peace or complacency, but during a period of grave emergency in our country. We should have the courage to rise to the occasion.

The provisions of this bill have been fully debated and explained. In the light of the Communist challenge of this period, the passage of such legislation is necessary. I base its passage on the ground of necessity in the national interest of our country. The national interest of our country is paramount to the personal interest of any Member or of any other American. The old saying, "In time of peace prepare for war," applies with special emphasis at this time. Our preparation in the light of the present danger may avert another world conflagration.

The pending bill is an important part of our defense preparation and of possible world war avoidance. Without again discussing in detail the various provisions of the pending bill, an important provision, in my mind, is that part which provides that after a 6 months' period of service, insofar as the Ready Reserves is concerned, they cannot be called back without concurrent act of Congress. Some Members are disturbed that there is no time limit to this bill, but it seems to me the answer to this is that through the power of appropriation the Congress has control of the situation from year to year. There are some Members who feel disturbed about military control of our country through the passage of this bill. That is a logical thought. It addressed itself to me as well as to others. If there are now those who entertain this thought, the provisions of the bill specifically prevent this. If enacted into law, there will be civilian control of its administration. At the present time there are sixteen to eighteen million Americans who are veterans; those of us who served in World War I and in World War II, and now those who are serving in Korea. Many of them who served in World War II have been called back into active service. A good number of those who served in World War II are now in Active Reserves. Many have been called to active service. If we had this legislation 4 or 5 years ago, they would not

have had to be. They are citizen soldiers. They are civilian-minded. And so will be the young men who will serve in accordance with this bill, if it becomes law. But in case of the latter, the very provisions of the pending bill provide for civilian control. There is a prohibition against military control: (a) by civilian control of the Commission; (b) by action of the Congress before the Ready Reserves can be called into active service; and (c) by the power of the Congress to control appropriations from year to year. The power to appropriate carries with it the power not to appropriate.

I might also observe, which to me is very important, that the pending bill is a means of assuring in the near future maximum trained manpower with a minimum of cost. When put into operation it will save billions of dollars. The very fact that we are compelled from year to year to spend such a tremendous amount of money, no matter how we may differ on this or that amendment in relation to economy, cannot help but attract itself to the mind of every Member. We have to save our economic strength. This bill, as the committee said, will save \$13,000,000,000 a year. If it even saves \$6,000,000,000 in the next 3 or 4 years, it will be a mighty contribution, when at the same time it is bringing about a maximum of trained manpower.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. MCCORMACK. In the pre-Revolutionary days there was a brave man by the name of Patrick Henry who said: "Give me liberty, or give me death." Human beings, weak as we are, we need in these days the spirit of Patrick Henry, yes, the spirit of countless of thousands of men and women who won the independence of the Nation. They served and fought for independence; we must have the courage to serve and vote for its preservation. And in doing this we cannot be too technical by saying: "I am for this bill, but—I am for this bill but it weakens the defense of our country," when even the opponents of the bill will admit that it strengthens the country.

If you have any doubt I urge you to resolve that doubt in favor of this bill, on the side of strength, in the light of the necessity for it. What action should I take in the national interest of my country? That is the question having in mind the danger existing, having in mind the efforts and the contributions of past generations of Americans; and they are speaking to us from the great beyond. The heritage we have cannot be forgotten because of emotionalism. That is resting upon us, whether we assume it or not.

Having in mind the country that I inherited and that I love, with the unwritten mandate from past generations of Americans to preserve it and pass it on to the next generation, having in mind these and many other thoughts and influences, exercising my judgment and searching my conscience that I may faithfully live with my conscience in the future, it is my firm conviction that the

only course I can take in the national interest of my country and in performing my direct trust and responsibility as a Member of the Congress of the United States is to vote for the passage of this bill.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, during the course of his remarks, the distinguished majority leader has again referred to a bill passed in 1941 as an extension of the Draft Act.

If he would refresh his memory, he would find that the sole purpose of that measure was to extend the 1-year training period of men drafted under the Selective Service Act of 1940 to 18 months. The 1941 bill did not terminate the Draft Act of 1940 at all. In fact, the bill of 1940 was for 5 years. It was passed on September 16, 1940, but there were no inductions under it until the last week of November 1940. I am advised by the Selective Service Department that only a few men had been inducted by December 7, 1940, which was 1 year before Pearl Harbor. To be exact, only 20,000 men were inducted between the last week of November 1940 and the end of the year 1940. The public drawing of the first draftees did not take place until October 29, 1940.

Under the circumstances if the bill to which the majority leader refers had been defeated, inductions under the 1940 act would have continued without interruption and no inductee would have been eligible for discharge until the last week of November 1941. Moreover, the very few who would have been released by Pearl Harbor day would have been subject to recall to active duty when war was declared.

Bear in mind that the act of 1940 provided for only 1 year of service for those inducted under it. The extension of service provided for in the 1941 bill was requested by the military authorities on the representation that more than 1 year was required to properly train those who were inducted under the 1940 act. In this connection it should be pointed out that some of those who were contending in 1941 that a year's training was insufficient now insist that 6 months' training in the UMT program is sufficient.

In the light of these facts the conclusion is inescapable that those who claim that the passage of the Service Extension Act of 1941 by a margin of one vote saved the Nation from disaster are either endeavoring to mislead the members of the committee or they are wholly unaware of the true facts.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the very able and distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I wish to pay tribute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr.

SHORT], who on yesterday gave such dynamic expression to his opposition to this measure. There has never been any doubt where DEWEY SHORT has stood on measures dealing with the whole of our citizenry in military matters. He would be the first, I am sure, to remind you that he has resisted all measures providing for the draft of American youth for military service during the 20 years he has been in the Congress, before, during, and after World War II, with one possible exception. That he should have this attitude is entirely understandable and I honor him for it.

A student of the ministry at colleges and seminaries both in this country and abroad, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] came to the Congress from the pulpit. It is to be expected, therefore, that his judgment is dominated by the lessons of the Gospel.

However, in this modern day when the peace and security of the entire world is placed in jeopardy by a handful of powerful men in Moscow and a philosophy of life which operates on the very antithesis of the lessons of the Bible, a principle which not only is anti-God, and anti-Christ, but also one which has no respect whatever for human life itself, having no tinge of righteousness or idealism, I fear it would be a tragic error for us as a Nation to be blinded to these realities of the world and place our complete reliance in the consummate idealism and religious fervor expounded by the gentleman from Missouri.

I pay tribute to DEWEY SHORT and compliment him for his devoted loyalty to the ideals which he learned as a youth and preached as a minister. I pray that there may be more men in the world like DEWEY SHORT—but unhappily there are not.

This is the fourth and final day of debate upon a proposal which, depending upon the outcome, might well be the determining factor of our security as a Nation in the future. If decided in the affirmative the new program unquestionably will have an impact upon our young male citizens in the future but I am not ready to admit that will be an injurious and harmful effect. On the contrary, rather, I firmly believe the whole program of military training for all of our citizens as set forth in this bill will have a very wholesome and stimulating consequence.

I have endeavored to listen rather closely to all the arguments of the opposition but have failed to find anything new. The arguments today are the same as were used in the debate on the same subject a year ago when the House by a vote of 9 to 1 determined to adopt some system under which every American boy would have 6 months of basic military training, providing the plan and program of training was subsequently found by the Congress to be acceptable. I am unwilling to believe that those who voted in the affirmative last year were not aware of the provisions of the bill to which they gave their vote and that the only reason why they supported the measure then was because it provided for extension of the draft and for 24 months of military service.

Nor do I feel it is fair to accept the explanation that those who supported the bill a year ago did so with the belief that a training program would not operate at the same time as men were being drafted for service. As a matter of fact, the wording of that law specifically suggests the probability that both systems would be operative at the same time, for it explicitly states that persons might be inducted into the training corps when the period of service required of persons under 19 years of age has been reduced or eliminated by the President or the Congress. In other words, induction into the Training Corps of men under 19 might occur at the same time as men over 19 were being drafted for service.

If we are opposed to the principle of universal military training, let us have the courage to say so openly, frankly, and honestly as so many of our colleagues such as the two gentlemen from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER and Mr. HOFFMAN], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS]. Why must we be a "yes, but" man when actually all along we are a "no" man. Or, if we approve the principle of UMT are we justified in voting against this plan just because it does not square in all particulars with our own individual ideas?

We should allow this proposal to come to a clear-cut vote and those who are opposed to it vote accordingly rather than hide behind the disingenuous device of trying to ride both horses of the issue by supporting a motion to recommend the measure.

Let us take another brief look at Public Law 51 adopted last year dealing with the subject of military training. In the first place, the title of it was "Universal Military Training and Service Act," indicating that it covered programs for the training of some men and for the military service of others. It set forth who would be liable, the period of training, the manner in which a training program would be inaugurated, the reserve obligation following training, permissive and statutory deferments, rate of compensation, adoption of the Selective Service System for the induction process, the right to volunteer for induction, the creation of the corps itself, the creation of the commission, and the administration of the program under the supervision of the commission. In other words, we did everything short of actually adopting a training program and requiring induction into the corps. Today we are considering the recommendations submitted by the training commission. Are they adequate for the purposes of a general training program and are they fair to the boys to be inducted? Those are the issues we really should be discussing in our debate on this bill.

I find it difficult to resist the conclusion that a lack of complete understanding of what is now being proposed is responsible for the volume of protests we all have received and that the opponents look upon this proposal as the same one which has been before the Congress for the last three decades. In fact, it is as different from the original American Legion plan for military training and service as day is from night.

Therefore, I urge the Members who do feel the necessity for some training program to keep their minds open until they have a full understanding of what is proposed before they make a decision.

Allow me to hurriedly run down through some of the arguments which have been advanced by various speakers in opposition.

It is charged that this is a radical departure from our historic practices, that it constitutes conscription and compulsion, both of which are repugnant to American ideals, that it represents a page torn from the book of the Old World, an involuntary service from which our ancestors fled, a virus of the disease of the vanquished which is now being infused into the bloodstream of the victor. Conscription is defined to be compulsory enrollment of men for military or naval service. There is not a single line in this bill as amended by the committee or any other law which requires a single day of military service for any members of the training corps and I defy any Member to show where that statement is in error. Those who refer to this bill as conscription just do not understand the bill.

With respect to compulsion and regimentation, this proposal is no more foreign to the American way than the requirement of every American youth, both boy and girl, from the age of 6 through the age of 16 to attend a public school for courses of education. Tune your ear to the voices of the past and you will hear those same outcries of compulsion, regimentation and invasion of liberty, as arguments against compulsory attendance at the public schools. Who here today would advocate repeal of those laws?

It is said that this proposal impinges upon the freedom of American youth; that it is servitude, bondage, and a mortgage upon their lives because they are given a Reserve status of 7½ years. Must I remind you that under the law today every boy who is drafted for service upon completion of his 24 months of duty goes into the Reserve arbitrarily and summarily for a period of 6 years? So far as requirements to serve in the Reserve, this bill treats trainees and service draftees exactly alike—a total of 8 years. In any event, a Reserve status constitutes no more of a mortgage upon the life of the American boy and is no more servitude or bondage than the liability to which he is otherwise exposed. No boy who is in the Reserve can be called to render military service without further action of Congress. His liability and his uncertainty for the future is no more burdensome than it would be if he were not in the Reserve. Right today, every male American from the age of 18 to 45 has constantly hanging over his head the sword of Damocles which upon resolution by the Congress might fall at any time and require him to bear arms for his country, whether he is in any Reserve or not. Do not talk about this being a slave bill unless you mean that the constitutional obligation to bear arms in defense of your Nation constitutes slavery.

Some have argued that inevitably in the course of military training American

youth would become debauched, demoralized, and Prussianized. In answer to this argument every American soldier or sailor who has ever served in any of our wars cries out in defiance. Fifteen million of them are living testimonials to the shallow depth of that argument. Except for those injured in combat, for every young man who you can show me has been harmed physically, morally, mentally, or spiritually by his military experience, I will show you 10,000 who have been transformed from boyhood into virile, vigorous, fearless, God-fearing men because of it.

The cry has gone out that these boys are going to be taught to kill. Our basic criminal jurisprudence from the earliest records have recognized the law of self-preservation—the right to kill in self-defense. All nature abounds with instances of a variety of methods by which her creatures defend themselves against predatory animals. Is it so wrong to learn to kill in order to prevent yourself from being killed? I prefer to look upon this training as lessons in which young men of America will be taught to protect themselves. If they are lessons in killing they are also lessons in living.

Furthermore, we must constantly remember that this program at all times is under the supervision of a civilian commission, composed at the moment and for many years to come of outstanding American citizens, with its system of inspection and its authority to pass upon rules and regulations governing the operation of the camps.

Someone has mentioned that this is simply a scheme for the social integration of American young manhood. The only agencies of government to which any boy might be sent for training is the Army, Navy, or the Air Force, no other; and certainly we can be sure that these three departments of government will not engage in any frivolous program of boondoggling or social experimentation.

With respect to criticism that this innovation will strip the farms of its labor and the colleges of their students, I would call to your attention an amendment offered by me which the committee adopted in principle but which does not appear in the bill itself because at the time it had not been reduced to writing, which would allow each boy to select the period of the year in which he would take the 6 months' training, making it possible for the farm boy to be trained in the winter and the college boy to be trained in the summer. That amendment will be offered next week and I am confident it will be adopted.

Probably the most persuasive argument against the bill is the alleged inequity of selecting one 18-year-old boy to go into training and his neighbor friend across the street, a 19-year-old, to go into service. That inequity exists today between the 19- and 20-year-olds, the 20- and 21-year-olds, the 21- and the 22-year-olds for the Congress has previously insisted that the older boys be taken for service before the younger ones. Actually, the inequality is more apparent than real. It is not an inequity, for the determination of those 18-year-olds who are to go into training will be determined by the local draft boards in what-

ever method they may determine but presumably some system of lottery. Certainly, if conditions require an element of selection where discretionary determination is allowed to work, a board composed of local citizens is the fairest and most equitable manner of dealing with it. If the boys to be trained are determined by lot, which I strongly feel should be the case, then there is no inequality whatever since all of the boys would be given the same chance. Depending upon the spin of the wheel, some might go into training with a subsequent Reserve status and the remainder be later called for active service. But it should always be borne in mind that if and when the reservists are called into action, I am certain the Congress of the future will require those without previous military duty to go first so that what appears to be a haven and refuge and preferential treatment today might well eventually turn out to be just the opposite.

Furthermore, I would remind you that this apparent inequality cannot endure for more than a few years at the most, during the period of transition while it is necessary to take some of the older boys for service at the same time as we are taking the younger ones for training. Eventually, if this program is adopted, it will be possible to eliminate the draft for service entirely. That is the purpose and the goal of the entire program.

The other and final argument against the program is its cost. Even the opponents, I think, will concede that as a reservoir of nonveteran civilians who have had military training is built up, the need for a standing army diminishes in an inverse ratio. The greater the Reserve, the lower a standing army to be required. The military specialists have given as their opinion that this ratio could safely be 3 to 1; that is, three reservists on an inactive status could relieve the need for one soldier on active duty.

Also, the opponents must admit that it does not cost as much to maintain a man in a Reserve status as it does to maintain one in active military service. Certainly it does not require a Pythagoras to come to the conclusion that it is cheaper to maintain three or four reservists, most of them engaged in their normal uninterrupted civilian pursuits, in the place of one active soldier whose service might be obviated because of the existence of reservists. Whether the saving is \$13,000,000,000, thirteen million, or thirteen thousand, this method of providing the military manpower needed in any future emergency, when fully implemented, is immeasurably less costly than the practice we have followed in recent years. The potential eventual savings of this program may well run into several billions of dollars annually.

I find it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to accept or even understand the logic of the argument advanced by some that since we have the draft it is sufficient to meet our military needs and a program of military training not required. In other words, they would prefer to draft a boy and require him to

serve in the military forces for 24 months than they would to draft a boy to receive military training for 6 months. For my part, I would much prefer to draft three boys each to have 6 months of training if by doing so I could avoid drafting one boy for 24 months of service.

The issue we have to decide today is really just that simple. It is either continue the draft and require all young America to be under a constant cloud of uncertainty with the probability that many of them will be called for 2 years of military duty or relieve them of that harassment by requiring all of them to have one-half year of military training. Frankly, I find the choice not at all difficult. Just ask yourself that question, Mr. Chairman. Would you rather draft a boy for 2 years of military service or draft three boys for one-half year of military training? Vote "no" on this bill and you vote both to keep all youth in a turmoil and to send many of them into really involuntary servitude for 2 years.

Earlier in this discussion I indicated my firm belief that most of the opposition to this measure, both from home and from those here in the House, was due to the fact that this particular proposal has not been fully understood. In proof of that conclusion, I want to relate to you an incident told me by Lt. Gen. Raymond S. McLain, one of the military members of the National Security Training Commission. After he had concluded his statement on this bill before the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, just recently, a spectator came to him and introduced himself as a minister from South Carolina. He said that on the previous Sunday he had preached a sermon against this bill, but now that he had heard the discussion and an explanation of it he had a much better understanding of its contents and that he was going back to South Carolina to preach many sermons in favor of it. I do urge once more that the Members keep an open mind until after the bill has been read next week and we have a better opportunity to understand it.

Mr. Chairman, I have never felt that a Member of Congress should be guided in his official judgment by the effect which his decision might have upon himself, his family, or his personal fortune—either political or financial. However, it might be charged by some person who does not know the fact that I am not qualified to speak or vote on this subject because I lack the attitude and experience of a parent and do not have the proper personal solicitude for the welfare of American youth. Lest this charge be made, I feel that the record should show the fact that I am a parent, that I have three children, that all of them are boys, and that all of the boys are of military age or soon will be of that age. I have taken my position on this matter not only from the standpoint of one whose oath and constitutional duty requires him to be responsible for maintaining our national defense, but also from the standpoint of a parent whose sons are subject to call. I want my sons, should they ever be summoned to render military service in the defense of their country, to be just as well

trained and equipped as is humanly possible, both in order that they may perform creditably in any assignment, even including the field of battle, and also to be more likely to survive in order to enjoy the blessings of the very thing they fight and kill in order to preserve.

These decisions are not easy ones for any of us to make. It is true that such a system as this providing for military training is completely new, but who is there who will deny that conditions in the world today are not also new and strange and foreign to us in the light of the past centuries? No one, of course, knows for a certainty what the future holds, but I have yet to find a single person from the highest to lowest position who does not contemplate an era of uncertainty, confusion, discouragement, and imminence of hostility.

Firm as I am in the belief that this system of training is not only fair to the boy, with ample safeguards for the protection of his spiritual and moral guidance, that it is needed by our Nation to provide us with a degree of security which the uncertainty of the times requires and through it to avoid the staggering, stupendous annual costs of an alternative program, I am ready to make my decision now with full confidence that even those who have previously written me with some heat and vehemence in opposition to this program, once they understand its full provisions and import will accept this program.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I should like to leave this one final thought or quotation. World conditions "prove more forcibly the necessity of obliging every citizen to be a soldier. This was the case with the Turks and Romans and must be that of every free state. We must train and classify the whole of our male citizens. We can never be safe until this is done."

These are not my words, Mr. Chairman. They are not the words of Hitler or Mussolini. They are not the words of one who would place the people in bondage or servitude. They are the words of Thomas Jefferson, himself the very spirit of freedom and democracy, uttered at the close of the War of 1812, when world conditions then appeared to be threatening.

Mr. Chairman, the course for me to follow is sharp and clear and unswerving. I take it without hesitancy or doubt, with full confidence that if our Nation follows that course, it will lead to a brighter day when the world can be shown the dawn of a lasting peace and be relieved of the cringing fear from the constant threat of war.

VOLUNTARY RESERVE PROGRAM, YES, COMPULSORY UMT, NO

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], in opening the debate on the question before us stated that the fate of

our country is involved in this problem. I agree with him, but for a different reason.

History is against this program and to commit our people to it is to condemn this great country to ultimate destruction. The unequivocal verdict of history is that improvement in military technique and the establishment of a gigantic military machine is invariably the symptom of a decline of its civilization. All around us today the signs are obvious. We are hell-bent for improving military techniques and building great land mass armies on the pretext that they will contain communism. Napoleon, Bismarck, Hitler, and Mussolini adopted that theory too, and where are they?

History further indicates that the warlike nation of today is the decadent nation of tomorrow. It has ever been so, and in the nature of things it must ever be so. The warrior state was always able to measure the values in art and literature and life itself, but it never suspected that the marching legions which protected it from attack at the time were the symbol of a destructive system of economics which had far greater forces at its command than all the organized armies in an organized world—forces which slowly but steadily undermined the walls and overthrew the defenses of all antique civilizations. The ancient world was not so much overthrown by invaders as devastated from within by the effects of its own war system, which had destroyed the vitality of both agricultural and industrial pursuits. We can never forget, Mr. Chairman, that it was Abraham Lincoln who said and who obviously had been reading history when he said it, that if our civilization is ever to be destroyed that it will be destroyed from within and not by the enemies from without.

Mr. Chairman, history also shows that the war system and the war methods have always been the chief foe of progress and that war is the chief obstacle to human advancement. Lands which today, thanks to the bounty of kindly mother nature and the toil of industrious men should blossom like the rose, lie buried in desert sands or starve from lack of cultivation in the midst of a seething cauldron of incessant war and preparations for more war.

In those early days wars seemed necessary to civilizations, yet it was war that destroyed those civilizations.

Mr. Chairman, we have the example of Arabia of old, when the Arabs, too, like so many other peoples, were given their chance to promote the welfare of humanity, but the ways of war were more pleasant and seemed more practical to them than the paths of peace. They took the sword and perished by the sword. For nearly 900 years they lived under the rule of the Turks.

In Assyria, there was presented the case of military overspecialization, and the overspecialization contained the immediate cause of her downfall. It involved not only the destruction of the Assyrian war machine but also the extinction of the Assyrian state and the extermination of the Assyrian people.

Ancient Greece, Rome, and Sparta traveled the same paths and reached the same end—destruction. Is that the verdict we shall impose upon future generations by approving the bill that is before us? As for me, I will have no part of it. I do not want my grandchildren to say someday that "grandpa voted us down the river."

Mr. Chairman, I again repeat that the verdict of history is against the objectives sought in the bill before us.

Mr. Chairman, I will support a real voluntary Army Reserve program. I have always supported that principle. The bill before us, however, is a far cry from the citizen-soldier plan advocated by the founders of our Government and followed in this country since it was established. The peacetime reservist is on a voluntary-service basis, and for many years our National Guard and the Organized Reserves have been the nucleus of our Armed Forces in times of international crisis.

This bill does not embody the universal military training plan long advocated by the American Legion. That organization, of which I have been a member since 1919, is supporting this measure in spite of the fact that it does not contain the principles or program of the Legion approved at national conventions. Its leaders today are grasping at the husk of UMT. They are chasing a will-o'-the-wisp.

I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of this committee what, if anything, has been done to establish a Voluntary Reserve system in this country with the National Guard and the Organized Reserve as the nucleus? Is it not true, Mr. Chairman, that there are today in our Reserve forces at least 2,500,000 officers and men who are serving on a voluntary basis?

I agree with the chairman of the Armed Services Committee that there is only one justification for UMT and that is to build a Reserve force but with the reservation that it be a voluntary Reserve. General Evans, executive director of the Reserve Officers Association, testified at the hearings:

This Reserve force of ours is no small percentage of our total population, as we have today in the Reserve components of all the services over 2,500,000 men.

This Reserve force is serving strictly today on a voluntary basis. General Evans said further that these veterans who joined the Reserves did so because they wanted to be of service to their country in the event of war. These men are real patriots and to deny them this opportunity would be unjust and discriminatory as they are well-trained men prepared to answer a call to service upon short notice.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think it will be denied that the Pentagon, where policies are made, does not look very kindly at the National Guard or the Organized Reserve Corps. The treatment accorded the Reserves at the outbreak of the Korean war was nothing short of scandalous. Neither Congress nor the reservists will ever forget it.

As a junior officer in World War I, I served with the National Guard units

of the Thirty-second Division from Michigan and Wisconsin. The Regular Army officers at that time did not want any part of the National Guard nor do they want any part of it now. This is common knowledge, yet it was the National Guard units that made possible the building of the armies that were necessary to win World Wars I and II.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is incumbent upon the Armed Services Committee of this House to bring to Congress a plan incorporating the ideas of our founding fathers, to wit: A militia system based on voluntary service rather than the compulsory military training bill that is now before us.

There is one phase of this legislation that has not been touched upon, and I have listened to all of the debate. I would like to stress it at this moment.

The Department of Defense is an arm of foreign policy. Basically the thing we are considering in this legislation is an implementation of present foreign policy, which at this moment has involved us not only in an undeclared war but it now requires the expenditure of untold billions of dollars and no doubt of untold millions of lives, all over the world.

Mr. Chairman, my mail has been heavy with protests against this bill from church people, labor unions, farm groups, and others who have been supporting the foreign policies of this administration. I want to say to them, and to you, that if our present foreign policy is continued we must have a Reserve component and we must continue to draft our young men to serve in the Armed Forces of our country. I am humbly and respectfully suggesting that those who are so vehement in their opposition to the issue before us in this bill, give serious consideration to their endorsements of our present foreign policy.

Another point that I want to make is that this matter is also related to foreign policy.

On last Sunday the American people were jolted by reports from Lisbon, Portugal, that the cost of military defense for Western Europe will be \$300,000,000,000. Who do you think is going to finance that scheme? It is perfectly obvious to me that the United States will be asked to underwrite and furnish the money, the men, and the material for most of it. Why build a military machine when this plan is sure to bankrupt the free world? Stalin does not have to fight a war to achieve his objective of world domination. All he has to do is to wait for the day when the people of this country will go broke, when our economic house caves in.

Mr. Chairman, why all this great military preparation when there is no evidence or sign of immediate war with the Communists? The Soviet does not need a war to defeat these United States because when defeat comes to us, it will be as a result of the bankruptcy of this Nation. High prices, inflation, and a military economy face our people—all because of a foreign policy which is attempting to fight a global war all over the world. We are trying to play the part of a world policeman when we do

not have the wealth nor the manpower to do it. We are following a senseless policy.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us should be sent back to the committee for further study. I am opposed to the bill in its present form.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, we are now engaged in a period of stress which may encompass the lifetime of most of us here today. Such a period will prove to be a tremendous drain upon the economy of our country if we are to maintain a huge standing army during these years of emergency. It is well, therefore, for us to evaluate the inadequacies of our present system and to devise, if we can, a suitable plan that will provide the same relative security of a large standing force by a less expensive means.

A year ago the Congress indicated its desire to entertain the consideration of some measure, to be later devised, and established a commission to formulate it. On that occasion in favoring that legislation, I stated to the House: "If we can devise a plan that will cut down on the standing army and lower the cost to the taxpayers and still have military security; if we can give some certainty to the plans of our youths; if we have the knowledge and assurance that we have trained reserves that can quickly augment our standing forces and make an enemy think twice before he attacks, I am in favor of such a plan." That was a year ago.

During the past 2 months, I have been constantly occupied with this problem, and day after day have listened to testimony pertaining to it. In fact, there has been no legislation yet presented to this Congress, while I have been a Member, to which I have devoted more attention and which has caused me greater concern.

At this hour, I can only report that to date no plan has been offered to the committee, or to the Congress, that has considered more than mere segments of the issue. The problem has not been thought through, and consequently no practicable solution has evolved.

Being an advocate of the general proposition, during the early stages of the hearing I became disturbed and uncomfortable as I watched proponents of the bill use a sledge hammer to get this particular bill enacted into law. Toy balloons of every description were floated, only to burst as they were examined. Claims for universal military training quite beyond the realm of clear logic did not appear to have the direct course to this problem which I had hoped would be pursued. As favorably disposed as I was at that time, I could not help but get the impression that square pegs would be forced to fit round holes and, good or bad, right or wrong, clearly or ill conceived, this bill must be enacted now.

I was surprised to read in the Commission report that the Congress had accepted the principle of universal military training before the mechanisms of that principle were even understood. I was at a loss to understand why the

Pentagon was not satisfied with the draft, but was insistent upon a UMT scheme that would induct 60,000 18-year-olds into training and follow that training immediately with 18 months' active duty which would be identical with the draft except taking them at a younger age. I failed to see how that proposal would build up a reserve of nonveterans on a universal scale, which was the announced intent of the proposal under consideration. In fact, you never knew what proposal was the issue of the moment, there were so many.

At this stage, the proponents of Universal Military Training had about unsold me with their arguments, and it was only by the equally fantastic claims of some of its opponents that I managed to remain in a neutral zone.

I waited a few days for the plan to unfold before I read the report of the Commission. I could tell at first reading that the problem that concerned me had never been considered. The broad outline and the machinery of a program we expected had been narrowed in scope to a degree where the only matter considered was the rules, regulations and jurisdiction pertaining to a 6 months' training program. Did anyone really think this involved all the problems we had on this subject? The words of the Commission which expressed an assumption of a vigorous reserve program revealed the small aspect of the problem to which they addressed themselves. This is in no sense a criticism of the Commission because the breadth of their study was undoubtedly defined for them and within the area assigned to them their report, in most respects, was of outstanding character.

Nevertheless, I was still comforted at this time in the belief that this vast issue which has been studied for years had been analyzed thoroughly. I was confident that the answers to the problems that bothered me would be forthcoming. As time elapsed and nobody touched upon these matters in their testimony and inquiries brought only inadequate responses, I asked the Pentagon not only once, but several times, to provide me with the answers. I was assured that I would receive this information but that it required time to prepare it. To this day, I have received no information whatsoever. I can perhaps understand why an opponent of a universal military training program, advocated by the Pentagon, would encounter difficulty securing information that was intended to be used against it. It is quite another matter when one who realizes the inadequacies of the present system and is receptive and indeed eager to the idea of finding a better system, is denied such information. The conclusions are obvious. Either there are no answers, or perhaps the answers would jeopardize passage of the bill. If it was a question of time, I believe a full study should be made and explained to the Congress before this bill is enacted into law.

Now what are some of these problems which have caused me concern and which have never been discussed?

I shall not attempt to discuss the savings idea which was conceived after the

hearings were completed and without the consultation or knowledge of the committee. All of us know that savings would be effectuated if the size of the standing forces would be reduced. These savings would be even greater if no UMT program was in effect. Therefore, it is not cost and savings alone that must be considered, but cost and savings in relation to an equal measure of military security. Obviously, if cost and savings were the only considerations, we could automatically cut down the size of our forces, without any substitution—but not many would advocate such a policy at this time.

The real questions I raise start where the Commission stops. Other matters could be resolved by appropriate amendments. On page 10 of the Commission's report you will find this very significant statement:

On the vital assumption, therefore, that a vigorous and efficient Reserve program will emerge from the current congressional deliberations on this subject, the three military services have planned respective UMT programs.

On page 12 of the same report we find the following observation:

While 16 weeks' instruction in these basic subjects would not fully qualify these trainees as specialists, it would give them a firm foundation on which to build during their subsequent duty in a Reserve unit. Here, in our opinion, is an excellent example of the vital need for a vigorous Reserve program as a complement to UMT.

Let us now examine the value of that vital assumption and the vigorous reserve that will be established.

Although we are in an air age, no thought whatsoever is given in the Air Force courses that will even begin to train those who must pilot, navigate or bomb from a plane. This apparently will be accomplished in some other plan. Therefore, there will be no reserve created through this source for that vital aspect of our national security.

There are, however, many courses of a technical nature in all services that will be offered such as intricate equipment maintenance, utilities, photography, communications, radar and ordnance. The men selected for these courses will be assigned according to their aptitude and upon the completion of their training will be sent home. It is then that my problems and their problems really arise.

If there is no armory for all the services where they live, what becomes of that vital assumption upon which the commission rested its case?

If armories are to be built in nearly every community in the United States, what is to be the cost of construction of these buildings and for the tremendously expensive equipment on which they are to work, and what is to be the source and cost of instructors for such a program?

Even if armories, equipment and instructors are made available for the ensuing Reserve program, there is nothing to make an individual attend a single drill. These new reservists never asked to be associated with the service, as did the organized and volunteer men today. It is true that their names will remain on paper for 7½ years and be subject

to active duty at any time. Is this the vigorous reserve program upon which the commission made its vital assumption? Are we going to risk the security of our country in a "paper" Reserve?

Is this the certainty to the youth of this country that we sought to correct, so that they could somewhat plan their lives? The commission's report on page 36 states "The maintenance of the present military force of 3,600,000 is requiring the extraction from the pool each year of more men than are entering it as they reach the age of 18½," and that "the prospect, then, is extended military service for all available young men." It is quite evident, therefore, that after the completion of their UMT training the inductees will be called for active duty and they know not when. The only certainty this bill gives to them is certain uncertainty.

This is no small program. It proposes to indoctrinate some 800,000 young men each year for a total obligation of 7½ years as Reserves, and, if the announced intent of the other Chamber is enacted, they can be called into active duty at any time that the President sees fit. If all the difficulties mentioned before were overcome, it would be possible to have over 6,000,000 men well trained and ready for action when the program is finally under way. Does this mean that this country will maintain on hand at all times sufficient modern equipment to equip these men immediately? If it does, is not the Congress entitled to know how it is to be done and what the costs will be? In the consideration of this matter we must not overlook the fact that the entire free world will look to America for its equipment, as was done during World War II and as is being done even today. If this equipment is not available, can we escape the conclusion of Winston Churchill, "In the first year of war production is nothing, in the second year a trickle, and in the third year a flood"? Men and equipment must be planned together. It is obvious why so many leaders in education, agriculture, production, labor, and church are opposed to enactment of this bill. They have never been really consulted. Everybody knows that a vigorous, efficient civilian economy is vital to success in any war. Regardless of how many lives a man's invention may save or how much needed technical equipment he can produce or the stomachs that his efforts must fill, the call is clear. Every man fights. The very thing that General Eisenhower said makes Russia hesitate to attack—our production—was never even considered. Is not this matter deserving of the scrutiny of the Congress before we adopt such a program?

Should we not also give some thought of how long it will take to transport these men overseas, since our real purpose is to save time? In the best year we could not transport much over 1,000,000 men, and in the first year it would be less. Should we not have some idea of this problem?

It would appear, then, that the training of these men in a 6 months' training camp is not the only issue that should be resolved before this bill should be enacted into law.

There have been times of emergency in the past when I have been prompted to vote hurriedly for legislation when all its factors were not completely understood, but I realized then the over-all need for its immediate adoption. Such is not the case today. Under the most favorable circumstances, the standing forces will not be reduced for 3 to 5 years.

My statement is not intended to approve or condemn UMT. Perhaps during this long period of stress, which may last 20 to 30 years, UMT may be the best solution—if somebody could only explain the plan or plans.

On page 7 of the Commission's report is a statement that should be understood by every Member before they vote on this bill, and I quote:

It—

The Commission—

does not pretend to have given complete consideration to all of the complex and difficult questions involved. A few of these require more thought than has been possible to give them in the relatively short period prescribed for completion of this first task.

Mr. Chairman, I agree thoroughly with the Commission in this statement. The subject does require more thought, not only by the Commission but also by the Congress, and should be recommitted for further study of the important related subjects.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to have been qualified to serve my country in time of war as a member of the Armed Forces. I served in World War I and was commissioned first in the Reserve Corps on June 2, 1917, and then in the Regular Army on July 7, 1918, resigning as captain, Corps of Engineers, late in 1919. I am proud to be a member, and a long-time member, of the American Legion, just as I am proud to be a member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and an honorary member of the Regular Veterans Association—so qualified because the membership of that association is composed exclusively of enlisted men. I am glad that I attended a military academy before going to college, and, in consequence thereof, I believe that some degree of advance military training hurts nobody but, in fact, does him a lot of good. I am in favor of a right program of military training for all youth qualified to serve in the Armed Forces in defense of their country in time of war. I have approved and support the type of universal military training that has long been advocated by the American Legion and other veterans organizations, and do today. I only wish that the pending measure, H. R. 5904, embodied that program, but it does not. It goes far and wide from it.

In the first place it has been stated by responsible members of the Armed Services Committee on the floor of this House during this debate that it is intended

that this measure and the Reserve forces supplied by it shall in the not distant future supplant the present selective-service system in respect to expansion of and procurement of replacements for the Armed Forces, and that hence it will do away with the present Selective Service System. In other words this UMT program involved in H. R. 5904 will obviate the need for the present Selective Service System by providing a Ready Reserve which, in effect, can graduate trainees from UMT directly into the Armed Forces. It is therefore not a peacetime universal military training bill as envisioned, I believe, by the American Legion but a substitute for the present Selective Service System. UMT, as envisioned by the veterans' organizations, and, as I have understood it, was for the purpose of providing some basic training to every qualified youth in the Nation in peacetime, in order to insure a condition of greater readiness in time of war or national emergency.

There is no provision contained in Public Law 51, of the Eighty-second Congress nor in this bill, H. R. 5904, which, in effect, separates UMT from selective service, but, in fact, the two are directly melded together in such a way that UMT can replace selective service by the gradual abandonment of it, and hence require the Congress to authorize calling into active duty members of the Ready Reserve who have graduated from UMT. Furthermore there are no provisions in H. R. 5904 or in Public Law 51 requiring that the deferment system set up under the Selective Service System shall be transferred to the Ready Reserve component and employed therein. Hence the great fear expressed by all of the technical and scientific manpower agencies in and out of the Government, except in the National Defense Establishment, that in a few years they will find a diminishing of available technical and scientific manpower to the point of extreme danger, not only to our Military Establishment directly but to the production agencies of the United States, both for defense and the civilian economy, and for the maintenance of essential civilian services, a condition which we have already suffered through lack of attention to the problem during World War II and a condition which, if not properly taken care of at this time and in the consideration of this measure and the Reserve Act, which now lies pending in the Senate, augurs evil for the future safety and welfare of our country.

Mr. Chairman, on Wednesday, February 27, I called attention to the fact that the pending bill referred to as the UMT bill, H. R. 5904, the Reserve Act, which passed the House on October 15, 1951, and now lies pending in the Senate, and several other acts, had not been properly considered as a unit although all of them should be integrated and considered as a whole in respect to the program for universal military training. Public Law 51 of the Eighty-second Congress, which was approved by the President on June 19, 1951, and is an amendment to the Selective Service Act, including among other things the authorization for the National Security Training Corps or

UMT provides in its amendment to section 4 (d) in subparagraph (3):

Each such person, on release from active training and service in the Armed Forces or from training in the National Security Training Corps, shall, if physically and mentally qualified, be transferred to a reserve component of the Armed Forces, and shall serve therein for the remainder of the period which he is required to serve under this paragraph and shall be deemed to be a member of such component during such period.

And then says:

Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent any person, while in a reserve component of the Armed Forces, from being ordered or called to active duty in such Armed Force.

It also provides in the amendment to section 5 (a) of the Selective Service Training Act, subparagraph (2):

No local board shall order for induction for training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States any person who has not attained the age of 19, if there is any person within the jurisdiction of such board who (1) is as much as 90 days older.

So it should be evident that while the UMT bill takes boys at 18 for 6 months of training, the Selective Service Act provides that selectees for the Armed Forces shall not be selected until they are 18½ and then not until all available persons 90 days older, or more, have been called into selective service.

Section 105 (b) of the UMT bill, H. R. 5904, provides:

The Selective Service System shall administer the process of inductions into the corps in accordance with the provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended.

Here is a conflict because one can be inducted for what is called national security training, or UMT, at 18 but one cannot be ordered for induction for service in the Armed Forces until one is at least 18½ years old and perhaps older. I understand that thus far they have not gone below the 19-year-old group if they have gone that far. By simply inducting all 18-year-olds for UMT none will be left for selective service, and that system ends.

Then comes another serious peculiarity as between the two bills because no means for deferment, that is no regulations providing for deferment, have been set up for those who will take the UMT program at 18. I am speaking now of those who are not already in something, such as the regular Army, Navy, and so forth, and, of course, at the age of 18, there will be very few students enrolled in an officer procurement program at colleges where the curriculum has been approved by the Secretary of Defense, and so forth. I understand that under the UMT bill, the Selective Service System is to be set up for the induction of persons who are to receive the 6 months' training in the National Security Training Corps, but to the best of my knowledge and ability to find it in the Record or the hearings of the committee, no one knows what the regulations and rules may be for the induction of persons into the UMT program. Of course, everyone knows what the regulations are in respect to service in the Armed Forces. In

consequence of this confusion, how is any young man to know whether or not he should at 18 volunteer directly for selection for service in the Armed Forces of the United States or volunteer for the 6 months' training program and thereafter go into the Reserves.

It is my understanding from the debate on the floor and particularly the remarks by the chairman of the committee [Mr. VINSON], that there are to be no deferments under the UMT program and particularly when it gets rolling and takes 800,000 young men a year. Now let us take a look at just what this may add up to in the long run for the young man. If he is inducted for UMT when he is 18 or thereabouts or for the reason that he wants to get his 6 months' training over with before he goes to college, he volunteers for UMT. Public Law 51, as I have quoted it above, transfers him after his 6 months' UMT into a Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and he shall serve therein for the remainder of the period of 7½ years which he is required to serve. That being the case, let us turn to the Reserve Act, which was passed in the House last October, and see what the provisions of that act may be as it passed the House. Turning to page 24 of H. R. 5426 Relating to the Reserve Components of the Armed Forces of the United States, we find chapter 3, section 234 (b), which reads as follows:

In time of national emergency hereafter proclaimed by the President or when otherwise authorized by law, any unit and the members thereof, or any member not assigned to a unit organized for the purpose of serving as such, of the Ready Reserve of any Reserve component may, by competent authority, be ordered to and required to perform active duty involuntarily for a period not to exceed 24 consecutive months: *Provided*, That Congress shall determine the number of members of the Reserve components necessary for the national security to be ordered to active duty, pursuant to this subsection prior to the exercise of the authority contained in this subsection.

Note that Congress is to say only how many are to be called to active duty. No deferments are provided for.

Now that provides a real quandary for the youth. If he goes directly into the Armed Forces through the Selective Service and Training Act, he will serve only 2 years under section 4 (b), as amended by Public Law 51, but if he is inducted under UMT, he will have the 6 months' training followed by 2 full years or 24 consecutive months, a total of training and service of 2½ years under UMT provisions rather than the 2 years under the Selective Service and Training Act. It might be added that section 234 (a) just preceding the one I have quoted, provides that in time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress—or when otherwise authorized by law—any unit and members thereof or any member not assigned to a unit may by competent authority be ordered to active duty involuntarily for the duration of the war or national emergency and for 6 months thereafter. But then turn back to section 208 (a) of the Reserve Act which says:

A member of the Reserve components required to serve therein pursuant to subsec-

tion (d) of section 4 or other section of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, or by any other provision of law, shall be placed in the Ready Reserve of his Armed Force without his consent for the remainder of his required term of service unless (1) he has served on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States for not less than 4 years, or (2) he has served for not less than 12 months on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States pursuant to section 21 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, and, in addition thereto, has served on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States for not less than 12 months between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, inclusive: *Provided*, That no person may be assigned or transferred to the National Guard of the United States or Air National Guard of the United States unless he first enlists or is appointed, as the case may be, in the National Guard or Air National Guard of the appropriate State, Territory, or District of Columbia. Except in time of war, or in time of national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress or proclaimed by the President, any such member who has completed 36 months of satisfactory participation in an accredited training program in the Ready Reserve, as prescribed by the appropriate Secretary, shall upon his request be transferred to the Standby Reserve for the remainder of his required term of service.

Just figure that one out if you can.

It seems obvious to me that the boy who selects the UMT program at this time is most liable to be called to active duty immediately upon completing his UMT of 6 months and be required to serve for an additional 24 months in the Armed Forces. Of course I realize that an act of Congress must be passed to permit that, but on the other hand let us look at section 205 of the Reserve Act which I presume is somewhat in the nature of a definition but it also seems to be an authorization. It says:

The Ready Reserve consists of those units or members of the Reserve components, or both, available for prompt entry into the active military service of the United States in any expansion of the active Armed Forces of the United States in time of war—

And that could very well mean that when we increase the Armed Forces from 3,600,000 to 3,700,000 for next year, the UMT graduates would thereupon be immediately available—

or in time of national emergency declared by the Congress or proclaimed by the President, or when otherwise authorized by law.

In other words Public Law 51, the currently considered UMT bill, and the Reserve Act which is still pending before the Senate, are terrifically confused and cause terrific confusion in the minds of anyone capable of reading the law who attempts to obtain the knowledge with which to advise young men. I can't see how it would be possible for the young man to himself understand what was to be expected of him.

But that is only a small part of the whole confusion.

Now let us consider for a moment what the effect is when a young man has completed his 6 months' UMT training at the age of 18½, let us say, and he is transferred to a Ready Reserve Component of the Armed Forces; and let us not forget that he is in the Ready Reserve. There is no provision whatever in the Reserve Act for deferment to

finish college or to go on and take training to become a doctor, a dentist, a scientist, or a competent engineer, or any of those other vocations which require service beyond the normal 4-year college course. The young man is in the Ready Reserve at the age of, let us say 18½ or perhaps as late as 19 years. Let us not forget likewise that we are still in a state of national emergency and that the state of war between ourselves and certain other countries has not yet been proclaimed at an end, so we are still at war. There is no provision whatever that I can discover that will in any of the acts, in respect to those who stand in the Ready Reserve, permit their deferment to finish college or even to go on to finish the current year.

If the young man does not perchance get inducted under the UMT provision, he is of course exempt under the Selective Service System for active duty so long as he ably performs in his college course or is a member of the ROTC. So let us take a look at the ROTC. Everyone here knows, I trust, that no boy can qualify for ROTC unless he is physically perfect, in other words able to meet all of the physical standards required of cadets at West Point and midshipmen at Annapolis. Therefore the physically perfect who have not already been taken at 18 or 18½ under UMT may qualify for deferment under ROTC provisions; that is, if he does not get caught by UMT first, and, therefore, he will have a chance to become a Reserve officer. But what about the boy who is very smart but whose vision instead of being 20/20 is 19/20. He can pass the standards for UMT and can be drafted into the UMT even though he may be at the top of his class, and then immediately thereafter, of course, he is transferred to the Ready Reserve and can be called out for active duty in the Armed Forces almost without warning and at any time because, as I said before, no deferments are provided for those who stand in the Ready Reserve. If you do not believe it take a look at section 6 (a) as amended by Public Law 51. That is the exemption section. Those exempted from selective service include a long list of officers and members of the Regular Army, cadets, and students enrolled in ROTC programs, "and members of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces while on active duty." If I read that correctly, and I think I do, then after a person has completed his 6 months of UMT, is in the Ready Reserve, and has not been called to active duty, he is immediately available for selective service to be called in for another period of training and 2 years in the Armed Forces or a total of 2½ years of training and service.

Now for a moment, let us turn to a wholly different and quite peculiar subject. This is in connection with the ROTC program and comes under an amendment to section 6 (d) of the Selective Service Act contained in Public Law 51. That provides, in effect, that anyone who becomes a member of an ROTC unit and agrees in writing to accept a commission if tendered and serves not less than 2 years on active duty, on

receipt of a commission, and agrees to remain a member of a Regular or Reserve component until the eighth anniversary of the receipt of his commission, is of course exempted from selective service and training so long as he remains in good standing. But under section 225 of the Reserve Act, which is still pending in the Senate, there appears on page 19 the following language:

After the effective date of this act, all appointments of Reserve officers shall be for an indefinite term.

And then it goes on to extend the term of every Reserve officer now holding such a commission to an indefinite term in the following language:

Each such officer shall hold his appointment for an indefinite term in lieu of the term of his current appointment unless he shall, within 6 months after written notification by competent authority which shall be given within 6 months from the effective date of this act, expressly decline to have his current appointment continued for an indefinite term, in which case the term of his current appointment shall not be affected by this section.

Now, of course, that is not going to affect the ROTC boys who are now juniors or below in college or who may join the ROTC later. They will have no opportunity to "expressly decline to have his current appointment continued," because the Reserve Act will then be in effect more than 6 months and his term shall then be for an indefinite term instead of the 8 years he bargained for.

I could go on at great length to point out the inconsistencies between the current UMT bill, Public Law 51, the Selective Service Act, and many other acts, to show that this legislation has not been adequately considered. The Reserve Act has passed the House; its consideration now lies exclusively in the United States Senate, and when the bill is ultimately returned to us, we will have an opportunity to vote up or down on a conference report and no amendments can be considered. As a Member of the Congress and representing a very large district in California, I assure you that if this UMT bill passes the House and the Reserve Act remains pending in the Senate and the ROTC Act is not amended and several other things are not changed, I could not competently advise any youth what course he should take. Thousands of boys, perhaps a small percentage of the total numbers now in college, are well qualified to go on and become professional men and scientists. Our Nation has a dire need for more professional men and young scientists. I can assure you that is the truth as that information comes to me as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Likewise it comes to me as a member of the American Society of Civil Engineers, and it comes to me from many other professional associations, including the American Association for the Advancement of Science. This is a scientific and technical age. If anyone can tell me how our Armed Forces of the future can hope to operate without competent technical and scientific personnel, both in and out of the Armed Forces, I would like to have him step

forth and speak. This is the atomic age, the age of guided missiles, the age of radar tracking guns, and all manner of equipment for the Armed Forces. We must have good soldiers, of course, along with truck drivers, tank drivers, and so forth, but without our technical and scientific personnel, I want to know where anyone in this hall expects our Armed Forces to be in the event of conflict.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the confusion is not only in my mind; it is, in fact, confusion. As one of those who has done his utmost in the past to bring our National Defense Establishment to its topmost peak, and as one who is deeply interested in the proper protection of his country and its welfare, I am very anxious and earnest in my desire to have a proper system established for the defense of our country. I am perfectly agreeable that every young man in the United States receive at least basic training in some branch of the Armed Forces. That is along the line of the original American Legion program for universal military training. I believe that their original term of such training was 17 weeks, a term which could be completed in one summer. But there is complete confusion in this bill before us, when coupled with Public Law 51, and with the possibilities that may arise under the Reserve Act now pending in the Senate, coupled furthermore with the ROTC Act, and all of these other acts that affect our Armed Forces. While I recognize the serious difficulties encountered by our distinguished Committee on the Armed Services, I respectfully suggest that they take the bill back into their bosom, study it further in connection with all of these other things, and bring to us here a proper program which we can enact before the close of this Congress. I think it can be done. It should be done. But this measure now before us only confounds confusion further. I shall have to vote for its return to the committee in a vote for recommitment, unless, in the amendment period, it can be so amended as to bring some order out of the chaos which it now presents, I shall have to vote against it.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, the very difficult subject of universal military training is one of wide difference of opinion and a great deal of controversy. This is reflected not only in the divergence of views expressed here in this debate but also in the great volume of printed material and heavy mail. I think probably most Members will testify as I can, that this issue of universal military training has called forth a greater and perhaps a more vigorous public response than any other legislative subject in recent years.

I have deliberately waited until the closing hours of the debate to express myself. I have earnestly sought to consider all sides of the question and I have deliberately refrained from expressing or

even adhering to a firm opinion. I believe such an attitude is the essence of representative government—to withhold judgment until the evidence and arguments have been heard. I have sought to follow this procedure.

Now, finally I have come to the conclusion that I must and will vote against the universal military training bill, H. R. 5904, now pending. My reasons are as follows:

In the first place, I dislike exceedingly the way this matter has been handled. Last year, despite the protest of a very substantial minority, the provisions for universal military training and the extension of the selective service were brought to the floor in one package. It seemed to a great many of the Members that this was an attempt to bludgeon the House into accepting the universal military training plan by connecting it with the necessity of extending the selective service. The reason for the extension of selective service was obvious, since otherwise we would afford no relief for the men fighting in Korea. But to attach the universal military training principle to that extension was an unfair use of the legislative process, in the opinion of many Members. It was deeply and sincerely resented.

This year, in following the report of the Commission set up by the last legislation, the committee held extensive hearings. As has already been pointed out in debate, it has been difficult if not impossible to follow the various bills which have been approved and then dumped into the discard by the majority of the Armed Services Committee. It was not until this legislation actually was reported that a Member of the House could know what was to be presented. Even yet, with the rumors flying around that severe and drastic amendments are to be offered and adopted, it is not at all sure what kind of legislation will finally eventuate from the Committee of the Whole. My complaint is, therefore, that I am highly critical of the manner in which this legislation has been handled, both this year and last.

My second reason for opposing this bill is that in my honest opinion it will destroy the Reserves and the National Guard. A fundamental concept in our law is that every able-bodied man is a member of the militia. It is embodied in the Constitution of the United States and also in the constitution of every state. However, the militia, until it is called into Federal service, is an arm of State government. That is the idea that is in the background of the National Guard and in my opinion should continue to be.

Universal military training as shown by the testimony of the Commanding Officer of the National Guard, General Walsh, would destroy that organization. Certainly it changes the fundamental and constitutional concept of the militia. It turns the National Guard into an arm of the Federal, rather than the State governments. It is claimed by the proponents of this legislation, that its enactment will strengthen the National Guard. I respectfully must differ with that opinion, since it is clear to me that under this universal military training

bill, the National Guard will become an adjunct of the Federal military machine and will thus have its autonomy and State relationship completely destroyed.

It cannot be denied by any impartial observer that the National Guard has been one of the bulwarks of national defense in time of emergency. That has happened time and again. We in the State of Iowa are extremely proud of that organization in our State. I doubt that any thinking Iowan interested in national defense would wish the enactment of legislation which would destroy that powerful State institution.

Much the same observation can be applied to the Organized and Unorganized Reserves. This bill would channel every bit of American manpower into universal military training. The Reserve organization, despite recent legislation to strengthen it, would die. Like the National Guard, the Reserves have served capably, courageously and honorably in wars that the United States has engaged in. Certainly, it should not be destroyed.

I had hoped when this legislation came before the committee that consideration would be given to coordinating the program of universal military training with the Reserve Officers Training Corps and the National Guard. I introduced a bill to that end in the Congress. The Defense Department rendered an adverse report on it and so far as I know, the matter was not given serious consideration by the Committee on Armed Services.

In my judgment it would be a grave mistake to destroy the Reserves and the National Guard, which I am sure this bill will do.

My third question about this legislation is the basic concept of universal military training. Frankly, I believe that some discipline and training in the art of defense will do no harm to any boy. In fact, in the proper environment it could result in great benefit to many. This legislation, however, goes far beyond such a concept and shows a definite trend toward militarism in the United States of America. It does not end with training a young man to defend himself in a military organization, but goes far beyond that and would militarize our entire social order. It becomes the permanent policy of our country, for this bill has no termination date. With a war raging in Korea, and with selective service already providing all the manpower the Armed Forces can efficiently use, how can it be wise to superimpose universal military training at this time?

Having been active in the American Legion for many years, I have been extremely interested in its policy with respect to this bill. I am skeptical of the notion that this bill represents the true wish of the rank and file of the American Legion or any other service organization. This is not universal service. This is a compulsory militarization of the youth of America. There is a vast distinction between universal service and compulsory service.

Finally, my last reason for objecting to this legislation at this time is that I have no confidence in the effective ad-

ministration of such a law. Revelations of corruption and waste are rampant which extend through the civil and military organizations of the present executive department. The passage of this legislation would but open up new and more abundant opportunities for the continuation of such irregularities.

Without authority of Congress, the Executive has scattered American troops all over the world, Korea, Europe, Africa, and many other places of which we have no information. This apparently is a desperate final effort to shore up a bungling and incompetent and contradictory foreign policy. To now make possible such new and colossal power over the youth of America would be folly in the extreme. I shall vote against this legislation.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, those with a lust for power know that there is no more potent instrument to gain dictatorial power than through compulsory military training.

As a part of my remarks, I am inserting an article, *Universal Training: A Fraud*, by Hoffman Nickerson, which appeared in the Freeman:

Compulsory universal military training without automatic liability for service is an absolute fraud. Universal military training and service are frauds as far as the present emergency is concerned because it is physically impossible to start such a system quickly. Universal liability for service and compulsory selective service are necessary evils in an emergency.

On the other hand, since compulsion is at best a necessary evil, and since one of the worst features of our time is the widespread enthusiasm for clubbing people into uniformity, lovers of liberty should do their level best to make certain that the present emergency shall not be used to put our country into a permanent strait-jacket. The iron logic of military necessity and military efficiency should be our sole guide, and the "mania for compulsion"—as a recent number of the Freeman aptly called it—should be shunned like the plague.

Of course, a minimum of compulsion is necessary in every organized society; there must be laws and policemen to enforce those laws. In war and in preparing for war this compulsion must take a harsh form; the members of the armed services must be protected against their natural weaknesses, such as dislike for hardships and fear of getting hurt, by knowing that they will be heavily punished in one way or another if they yield to those weaknesses. In other words, war is a communal thing, and the great wars of our time make huge doses of compulsion necessary. Thus, war has been the food on which the monstrous Leviathan states of today have grown so great. Historically, the longest single invasion of individual liberties was perpetrated when the Revolutionary French Republic proclaimed the levy in mass not merely for home defense but for general military service. Napoleon continued the system; after his fall Prussia added compulsory and universal peacetime training; and after 1870 all Europe more or less copied Prussia. Oddly enough, although sociologists are now as thick as flies in summertime, the relation between war and the social order has been little studied. If the statement

that mass armies and great wars have been a chief factor in pushing Europe toward Marxism seems a little bold, at least they have not prevented most of Europe from going Marxist.

For years past an active propaganda has tried to blur the truth that compulsion is at best a necessary evil. The ink was hardly dry on the German and Japanese surrenders before the War Department began hollering for universal compulsion; not for any emergency then visible to the public or—apparently—to our leaders, but just for the hell of it. In the first place, a peacetime mass army is inappropriate to the geographical situation and therefore to the national strategy of the United States—a fundamental point to which we shall return later in this article. In the second place, the raising of a mass army would have flatly contradicted the wholesale demobilization of our Ground Forces then in progress, which demobilization was based upon the idea that the Soviets would honor their obligations. Nor is there the slightest reason to believe that the High Command of our Army was more foreseeing than our political leaders as to what the Soviets would actually do, for not one Army officer risked his career in order to protest publicly against the general demobilization of 1945, as various naval officers afterward protested against what now appears to have been a subsequent error in military policy, i. e., overemphasis upon that form of wholesale baby killing politely known as strategic bombing.

The high point of compulsion plus military inefficiency was reached in the 1947 Report of the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training. That military monstrosity would have forced all our young men into uniform for 6 months without adding a single recruit to any of the active services, and would have increased the civilian components only slowly and uncertainly by means of a complicated series of options, which in many cases could have been juggled around until the cows came home. This feat of now-you-see-it-and-now-you-don't prestidigitation would have been accomplished by setting up an enormous training corps not under military law but only under a watered-down version thereof. The resulting need for a considerable army of instructors and caretakers from the Regular services would have seriously diminished the available striking power of those services. The scheme also sprouted a lush crop of political jokers, all calculated to increase centralized Federal power without even a pretense of genuine military advantage. Congress rightly refused to enact the absurd proposal, but its soul still goes marching on—or rather lurching on—as we shall see in a moment.

Instead, in 1948, Congress enacted a sensible selective service law under which the drafted men, after a necessary minimum of recruit training, go directly into organized, regular units where they can learn from their more experienced comrades as well as from their instructors. A notable merit of such a system is that it is flexible. Within wide limits it permits the speeding up or slowing down of recruitment according to the evident necessities of the near future.

So matters stood when our President took the doubtful step of scrapping the Defense Department War Plan which called for only the use of American Naval and Air Forces in case of an invasion of South Korea.

The hell which promptly broke loose after the landing of United States ground troops in Korea has at least had the melancholy merit of reminding us of realities.

Alas, our military age of innocence is not yet over. Only the other day Oscar Ewing proposed high school universal military training. That apostle of socialized medicine said that "if . . . necessary the high school period might be . . . 5 years instead of the present 4 in order to achieve the basic training goal," and that

under his plan "the young would be kept out of Army camps almost until the time they were ready for field service." In other words, near-readiness for field service is to be developed on the athletic fields of high schools. Similarly, the senior high school students of a New York Times Youth Forum unanimously agreed that universal military training should be instituted now.

Disregarding these straws in the wind, a sinister symptom of the attempt rivet permanent compulsions under us under cover of the present emergency appears in the current circular of the Military Training Camps Association. That body is the successor of the so-called Plattsburg group which, in collaboration with the late Gen. Leonard Wood, did admirable work in training prospective officer candidates just before our entry into World War I. Today its letter paper is headed by the names of three civilian aides to the Secretary of the Army, and its executive committee includes a number of eminent and greatly respected men, most of them from the New York area and practically all of them of a conservative sort.

Unfortunately, however, they consider that permanent universal military training and service would strengthen our institutions and our social order, and seem blind to the social aspect of the matter as a step toward socialism by increasing the already excessive powers of our nominally Federal Government. Accordingly their circular recommends "a durable military manpower law suited as well for times of peace as for partial and for total mobilization." The first of their alternative proposals is "universal military training at 18 for 1 year with service only if called"; their second, "universal military service at 19 for 2 years," and only in third place do they speak of "selective service at ages 19 to 26 for 2 years."

Proposal No. 1 is unrealistic in itself and unrelated to the present emergency. As far as purely military policy is concerned, training without liability for service is only a complicated mumbo-jumbo which would produce a minimum of actual military results at a maximum cost in money and loss of manpower. No. 2, although not a sham like No. 1, is nevertheless unsatisfactory in point of age, and still more because it would be an inflexible, rigid method of raising a large army. The average company commander would much prefer to have a sprinkling of men in their early twenties and even in their late twenties as ballast for his 19-year-old recruits. The personnel section of any general staff would like to be able to regulate the flow of recruits according to the need for them instead of having to train an annual class of fixed numbers.

The same fault of rigidity characterizes the plan proposed by President Conant, of Harvard, who would like to see all valid young men drafted for 2 years or 27 months of military service at 18 or at the end of high school, whichever is later. He also suggests that those physically incapable of armed service should be drafted for such duties as they can perform. Those familiar with his political attitudes, his scandalous tolerance of fellow-traveling professors, his enthusiasm for raising the already confiscatory rates of the inheritance tax, his desire to put our universities under Federal control by grants of Federal tax monies, and his repetitions of the Communist slogan of a classless society, will not be astonished at his desire to regiment even those physically handicapped.

Fortunately the Conant plan has been promptly attacked by the executive committee of the Association of Colleges and Universities of the State of New York, which committee has pointed out the educational and military unwisdom of calling up entire age groups at one time. General Hershey's Selective Service Scientific Advisory Service Committee has done even better. Under the leadership, so it is said, of President Charles

W. Cole, of Amherst, that body has opposed universal training altogether, and is advocating extended selective service instead.

When counsels are divided, it is wise to go back to first principles. First, where and for what purposes was universal training developed? Next, how does geography necessarily affect our national strategy? Finally, what is, so far, the nature of the present emergency?

Universal training originated in Europe among nations separated only by land frontiers across which men can walk, or by rivers across which bridges can be thrown. Under these conditions military efficiency meant the cheapest possible method of raising the largest possible trained army which could be hurled into action at the utmost possible speed. Before World War I every valid Frenchman was trained and kept with the colors for 3 years, while other countries followed the same pattern a little less strenuously. The essence of the system was the enormous mass of trained reserves, of which the younger classes in various countries were kept up to scratch by frequently recalling them for maneuvers. After about 20 years of universal training, a general mobilization would call up a tenth of the entire population, say roughly a fifth of all males. Every reservist knew the exact place at which he must report within a few hours, and at that place his entire equipment was waiting for him. Next to numbers, the prime necessity was speed. One day saved in mobilizing might well make all the difference between triumph and disaster. For instance, in 1914 it was the Germans' ability to use reserve divisions from the first days of mobilization which brought France to the ragged edge of immediate and total defeat. But note well that in order to get the full benefit from such a system you must have land frontiers, numbers rather than highly specialized equipment must be decisive, and the system must have been practiced continuously for the better part of a generation.

Now as far as all other great powers are concerned, the United States is strategically an island. Flying has indeed altered the applications of this truth, but the basic truth remains. If anyone thinks that airplanes have abolished the effect of distance and salt water upon strategy, he should get his head examined. In any great war we or our opponents must cross either vast oceans or almost uninhabitable Arctic wastes. Command of the sea, insofar as the sea and the air over it can be commanded, is vital.

Thus the bottleneck of military effort on either side cannot be merely the number of trained men available. It must be the fighting and carrying capacity of the available planes and ships. Since shipping and plane tonnage are the necessary foundation of all United States strategy, the ideal United States Army would be a sort of glorified Marine Corps, an elite body which strives for quality rather than quantity for the simple reason that one good shot makes at least as many hits on the enemy as two bad shots, and requires only half as much cargo-carrying tonnage to support him overseas. Of course there must also be a cadre of officers and noncoms to train replacements and reserves. But no United States mass army, even if complete to the last button, could ever be rushed into action like the continental European armed hordes. The reader may ponder the title of a book on the supply system for the Normandy campaign, *Ten Million Tons to Eisenhower*.

Finally, even the outlines of the present emergency are not clear. This is by no means a plea for sitting back and taking things easy—far from it. It is a mere statement of fact that our chief possible enemy, who is known to hold strong cards, has not yet fully shown his hand, and that there is grave doubt as to who would really be on our side in a showdown, and to what extent.

These uncertainties demand the utmost elasticity in our own military policy. In any case we must be strong at sea and in the air—the two are today inextricable. We must also be much stronger on the ground than we now are; the idea of getting a military decision by air alone against an enemy who holds a vast continental land mass is too doubtful to bother about. The real questions are: How much of our total resources should go into armed preparedness and how much into strengthening our own economy? Also, what proportion of our armed preparedness should go into a ground army?

The present emergency results from the clash between Communist expansion and Soviet imperialism on one side and the Truman doctrine of containing communism everywhere on the other side. Since the United States has only about 6 percent of the world's population, the Simon-pure Truman doctrine is bunk—if any sufficiently large local group of the remaining 94 percent choose or permit themselves to go Communist, we could not stop them with United States armed force alone. Even if we made ourselves a semi-Sovietized slave state, still our resources would be insufficient if we did not have strong non-American support.

If we do not limit our military commitments we should prepare our minds for a series of bigger and worse Koreas. In the Far East we have little choice except either to get off the Asiatic mainland or to use armies of Asiatics to do most of the fighting. In Europe General Eisenhower, as Hanson Baldwin truly says, commands only a "shadow force" of 19 western divisions, whereas the Soviets have 30 divisions in Eastern Germany, 60 in their European satellites and 145 in the U. S. S. R., a total of 235. Should the Red Army march we would be lucky if any European front forward of the Pyrenees could be held.

The proposition is up to the West Europeans. If they cannot begin promptly to do a great deal more for themselves than they have been doing, then our only logical moves will be: either back to Pan-Americanism or the holding of minimum footholds in the Old World, from which future offensives could be launched. For such strategies, sea and air power plus a moderate-sized army would suffice. The existing situation puts a premium on the flexibility which selective service can give, and universal service by classes cannot.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LANTAFF].

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, many sound arguments have been advanced by sincere opponents of universal military training in urging us to vote against H. R. 5904. On the other hand, equally forceful arguments have been presented by the proponents of the measure. The persuasive arguments, both for and against universal military training, have many of this body in a dilemma. The distinguished chairman of the committee cites figures to prove that we can save \$13,000,000,000 annually when the program is fully implemented. The opponents counter by saying that the program will mean added expense. Some argue that it is the only way we can build up a well-trained Reserve for any emergency; while others contend that these men would have to be retrained and that it has always been the shortage of weapons and not the shortage of trained manpower that has hindered our military build-up in the past. Eloquent speakers have argued that it is against American tradition, while others point

out that universal military training was the original concept of preparedness in early America. Outstanding military leaders have voiced opinions both for and against such a program. The arguments then might well end in a virtual stalemate, were it not for one argument that, to me, is unanswerable. It is the argument that convinced me to vote for universal military training, not necessarily the plan proposed by the National Security Training Commission, because I have voiced objections to some features of that plan; but, ladies and gentlemen of the House, unless we take steps to initiate a program of basic military training in the immediate future, the bulk of our Reserve components will be made up almost entirely of the veterans of the Korean and present emergency. Without a program of universal military training, they will be the ones who will be called back to service in the event of future hostilities. It is a sad commentary upon our foresight to know that a system of universal military training placed in operation after World War II would have prevented our having had to call back to duty for the Korean war several hundred thousand reservists who were veterans of World War II.

I cannot, in good conscience, vote to recommit this measure, even though I hope it is amended in several respects, when I realize that, by so doing, I will have to look those veterans in the eye who fought through World War II and through Korea, and admit to them that, should another emergency arise, they will be the first to be called. It is therefore the duty of this Congress, in my opinion, to work out and adopt a sound program of universal military training; not merely to shirk the issue for political expediency by voting to recommit this measure.

During the course of the debate, I have heard many Members refer to the fact that the Armed Forces had scuttled the Reserve program for the purpose of forcing universal military training upon us. Having been a member of the Organized Reserve or of the National Guard for the past 18 years, I too can attest to the fact that the Reserve program has been neglected, abused and ignored by the armed services.

But that in itself has only been a part of the difficulty faced by the reserves. The weakness of any Reserve component program has always been the fact that basically trained men were not available for enlistment, plus the fact that the turn-over in enlisted personnel has been so great that it has been impossible to create truly effective units.

Testimony recently given to the House Armed Services Committee indicates that the turn-over in enlisted men in the National Guard runs as high as 30 percent per year. How can you expect to create an effective Reserve military organization with such a large yearly turn-over in personnel? As General Marshall said:

We started in June from a state of bankruptcy as to available trained reserves. Whatever Reserve organization we had were only 40 or 50 percent of strength and that

strength only partially trained. We had no resources, no established system for the creation of trained manpower.

Furthermore, the time spent in recruiting consumes a tremendously heavy portion of the time of the men and officers of any unit; and as a result, time that should be spent on the training of the unit as such is not available. It is only through some system of universal military training that we will ever have sufficient men in National Guard and Organized Reserve units to maintain an effective second line of defense. Therefore, if we refuse to adopt a sensible program of universal military training, we will not only be voting against the best interests of the World War II and the Korean veteran, but we will also be voting for the continuance of an inadequate, undermanned Reserve force not capable of immediate accomplishment of its assigned mission.

One of the defects that I believe exists in the legislation before us is the fact that, after a trainee completes his course of universal military training, he is then assigned to a theoretical paper Reserve, where he will stay for 7½ years unless he happens to be assigned to an active unit in the Reserve components whereby he can reduce his period of liability for service in the Ready Reserve to a period of 3 years. If the Armed Forces fail to create sufficient Reserve units, then most of these trainees will stay liable for service for 7½ years. But unless these trainees continue to keep pace with modern military developments and continue to receive military training of some type, the value of the training they receive under the universal military program will soon be of little significance.

Therefore, it seems imperative to me for us to insure that the maximum number of these trainees go into an organized unit in a Reserve component. Only in this manner, can maximum advantage be realized from the fact that they have received basic military training. Reserve units will be kept up to strength and trained as a unit. We can truly then have an effective, well-trained Reserve force.

In order to accomplish this, I will offer an amendment to the bill, amending section 105 (A) by providing that the number of persons inducted into the corps in any calendar year shall not exceed by more than 25 percent the number of spaces available in organized units of the reserve components for that calendar year. This will require the Armed Forces to either actively and energetically support a strong Reserve program, or else cut down on the number of men to be inducted into the corps each year.

It will also insure that the vast majority of the trainees are only liable for military service in the Ready Reserve for a period of 3 years, after which they will then revert to the Stand-by Reserve, as we provided in the Reserve legislation passed by the House last year.

If we adopt that concept which I believe is sound, it will mean that Reserve units will be organized to utilize to the maximum a trainee's skill, which he

thereafter acquires through his vocation or the special knowledge which he acquires in pursuing an education.

There is another part of this program, which incidentally we approved last year, that we should most certainly amend. That is the provision that we wrote into Public Law 51 requiring these trainees to be inducted for a period of 6 months' training. If you will examine the training schedules which were presented to the Armed Services Committee by the three services, it can readily be seen that their concept of basic military training goes far beyond the scope that I think was authorized by Congress.

For example, the Army training cycle specifically sets forth that basic military training will be given in 15 weeks, whereas 8 weeks are to be used for technical training and the development of small battlefield teams. Time will be devoted, for example, to training signal-message clerks, telephone linemen, and radio-maintenance men.

The Marine program contemplates 14 weeks for recruit and advanced individual training, and then 8 weeks of specialist training.

The program proposed by the Navy includes 12 weeks for so-called basic training, followed by 9 weeks of specialized training in such highly technical fields as electronics.

The Air Force training cycle includes an 8-weeks' basic military training course, followed by technical training in such subjects as metal working, budgetary accounting and disbursing, fabric, leather, and rubber, statistical machine accounting, and the fundamentals of radar.

It will be noted that in each of the training programs submitted, basic military training is to be completed in from 8 to 15 weeks. The question then arises: is this not what Congress had in mind, rather than to have the military attempt to train all types of specialists? Certainly this specialist training can best be acquired in private industry or in our colleges and universities.

Never before, at least since I have been connected with the armed services, has basic military training ever extended for such a period. During the last war, we gave basic military training in 13 weeks. As I recall it, when that war terminated we stepped the program up to 17 weeks. When Korea came along, the armed services went back to a basic military training program of 14 weeks; and then, under congressional pressure, again increased the amount of time devoted to basic military training to 16 weeks.

To determine whether or not that was not sufficient time, I secured a copy of some of the basic individual training programs of the Army. I have here before me the basic training program adopted by the Chief of the Army Field Forces for the Artillery. It is an exhaustive program of 16 weeks' duration and the training objective as set forth in that program cites that it is used (a): to train the enlisted men entering the Army without prior service in basic military subjects and fundamentals of basic

infantry combat which will insure that he—

First. Adjusts himself to Army life, and learns to live, work with, and understand his fellow man.

Second. Develops pride in the Army, and in his arm, and desires to carry on its traditions.

Third. Understand why he is to fight.

Fourth. Develops a sense of individual responsibility and understands the fundamental moral principles and basic obligations of the soldier.

Fifth. Respond in a positive manner to Army discipline and observes the rules of military courtesy and customs.

Sixth. Realizes the value of and is able to care for his person, and is able to administer first aid to himself and to others.

Seventh. Understands supply economy and maintains his clothing and equipment in garrison and in the field.

Eighth. Is able to take individual precautions against biological, radiological, and chemical attack.

Ninth. Is able to perform duty as member of a guard or a combat security group.

Tenth. Is able to march varying distances—including cross-country marching; move in the field using only the compass to maintain direction; locate himself and common objects on a map.

Eleventh. Understands the meaning of and need for basic intelligence; detects and properly reports simple military information; recognizes classified material and properly safeguards it; develops a security consciousness that will assure detection and action against subversive activities; defense against infiltration, guerrilla warfare, and enemy partisan activities.

Twelfth. Attains and maintains a state of physical condition commensurate with requirements for dismounted ground combat and consistent with the maximum capabilities of the individual in each case.

Thirteenth. Understands and is able to apply, under simulated or actual combat conditions, the principles of concealment and camouflage, cover, and movement, and is able to take individual protective action against aircraft, armor, and dismounted ground attacks.

Fourteenth. Is able to participate as a member of a patrol or act as an individual scout or observer.

Fifteenth. Qualifies in firing the individual weapon with which he is armed in field and combat firing. Fires either the rifle or carbine for familiarization and other weapons to include grenades, light machine gun, and rocket launchers with an acceptable degree of accuracy.

Sixteenth. Recognizes the superiority of American infantry weapons over those of his enemy.

Seventeenth. Is proficient in the use of the bayonet or bayonet knife and in unarmed defense.

Eighteenth. Understands and practices organization and teamwork in combat to include squad tactics of the infantry rifle squad.

(b) Concurrently with the attainment of the foregoing objectives, to complete

the minimum of branch material instruction which will qualify the enlisted man as a loss replacement fire direction specialist specifically, and to enable him to—

First. Perform duties incident to preparation of artillery firing data or serve as an enlisted specialist in a field artillery fire direction center.

Second. Serve as horizontal and vertical control operator. Prepare a firing chart by plotting location of base points, battery positions, check points, and targets on a grid sheet, map, or photomap. Plot the location of supported units and no-fire lines. Determine and record altitudes of targets for plotting on firing chart. Interpolate ranges and elevations. Compute and announce range, deflection, and site.

Third. Serve as a computer in a field artillery fire-direction center. Convert measured and computed data to fire commands, apply corrections, and announce fire commands to firing battery. Compute meteorological and velocity error corrections; compute time and range corrections from registration and apply to graphical firing table. Compute and announce data for replot of observed fire targets. Prepare battery data sheets for prearranged fire missions.

Fourth. Serve as artillery recorder. Record firing battery data such as minimum elevation, safety limits, and deflection. Record fire commands, reports, messages, elevation, deflections, and ammunition receipts and expenditures. Keep record of prearranged fire missions. Act as a member of battery fire-direction center when battery is not under battalion control. Operate aiming circle to assist battery executive.

Fifth. Assist field artillery operations sergeant in the establishment and posting of an operations map; and in preparation of graphic sections of training and tactical plans. Issue maps to fire-direction personnel.

Sixth. Assist in the operation of fire-direction center. Coordinate with communications personnel in the installation of wire and radio communications. Assist in preparation of operational charts and data. Verify accuracy of all fire-direction computations and operations. Prepare and keep current ammunition records and reports. Maintenance of fire-direction equipment for condition and serviceability.

Seventh. To be fully acquainted with and be able to perform duties of fire-direction and liaison operator, MOS 5704.

Eighth. Be able to use and apply the mil relation formula. Be able to solve simple algebraic formulas with speed and accuracy. Be able to use all fire-direction equipment. Have elementary knowledge of tactics and technique of employing field artillery. Be familiar with the organization and employment of artillery and armor.

Now, if 16 weeks is sufficient time to train a raw recruit without any prior training in that manner, certainly we do not have to consume 6 months of a boy's life to give him basic military training for the Reserves.

Of interest in this connection is the testimony of Gen. James G. Christian-

sen, of the Office of the Chief of Engineers, before the House Appropriations Committee. It reads as follows:

Representative ENGEL. Now, how long does it take to train an infantry soldier, . . . a boy right off the farm or out of the gas station . . . ?

General CHRISTIANSEN. We found 17 weeks . . . developed the man so that as an individual he could go into a combat organization and fight as a part of that combat organization effectively.

Representative ENGEL. What chance has that boy with an experienced man in the enemy forces in hand-to-hand combat with bayonets, rifle butts, and so forth?

General CHRISTIANSEN. He probably would have just as much chance as the other man, and possibly a little bit more, because he has not been tired out.

Representative ENGEL. Do you mean to tell me that a boy who has had only 17 weeks' training can learn how to fight with the bayonet in hand-to-hand combat and know all the tricks to go with it as well as an enemy who has been at it for a couple of years?

General CHRISTIANSEN. Yes; I think he can.

For these reasons I therefore hope to amend H. R. 5904 to provide that trainees will be inducted for a maximum period of 4 months rather than 6 months. Not only will we be able to give these trainees basic military training in that period, as we are now doing and as we have always done to train men as combat replacements, but we will enable the boy who gets out of high school to take his basic military training during that summer so that he can go on to college in the fall.

This will meet one of the most violent objections to the program presented to us for consideration. This is the program originally advocated by the American Legion. It carried the endorsement of the Reserve Officers' Association, and I am advised that such an amendment would meet with the full approval of the American Association of Colleges and Universities.

In closing let me urge you again to strive diligently to perfect a program of basic military training that will prevent the inequities of double service by some and no service by others, such as we have followed in the past. Let us not shirk our duties by recommitting this issue. If you are against the principle of UMT, then vote against this or any other similar measure. If you favor UMT but do not like some provisions of this plan, then let us obtain the best possible measure here on the floor. We owe our Korean veterans much more than political double talk that we favored UMT, but did not like this particular proposal.

In voting on this issue keep in mind that the boy fighting today in the frozen terrain of Korea, too busy to write you, perhaps, is the soldier you will again call away from his home, his job, and his family unless this Congress provides now a system of universal military training.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER].

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, the universal military training bill which has been under discussion in the House for the past week, I believe has attracted the membership to the floor in greater numbers than any bill which has come before the Congress during my tenure

of office. The great concern among the Members develops from their keen sense of responsibility that we are here called to embark on a new and untried field as far as the United States of America is concerned. The step-by-step action taken regarding this legislation, has raised doubt in the minds of many as to whether or not this is a proper legislative process.

Last year, when it was necessary to extend the draft law, the authorization for a Commission to study universal military training and make a report to the Congress, was embodied in that legislation. This year we are called upon to put into effect a law establishing universal military training. The Commission, in its report to the Armed Services Committee, among other uncertain statements had this to say on page 7 of their October 1951 report, and I quote:

While the Commission believes it has developed the broad outline of a sound and workable program which should be adopted by the Congress, it does not pretend to have given complete consideration to all of the complex and difficult questions involved. A few of these require more thought than has been possible to give them in the relatively short period prescribed for completion of this first task.

The Armed Services Committee met for many weeks in an effort to develop a bill. Four committee prints of a proposed bill were issued before the final draft, which we are now considering, was brought to the floor of the House. Members of the committee, who were extremely friendly and espoused universal military training, have been diligent in their attendance at committee meetings and have felt that the bill now pending before us will not serve the purpose of establishing a proper reserve in compliance with our American ideals, and that the cost would be beyond our ability to pay and still retain our American way of life.

The gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman WILLIAM BATES, a member of the committee and a World War II veteran with 9 years' service as a Regular Navy commander, made this very pertinent observation in his speech today which I believe is worthy of emphasizing, and I quote:

During the past 2 months, I have been constantly occupied with this problem, and day after day have listened to testimony to it. . . . To date no plan has been offered to the committee, or to the Congress, that has considered more than mere segments of this issue.

Many outstanding speeches have been made in favor of and in opposition to the present legislation. It is generally rumored that the proponents of the measure are willing to accept most any type of an amendment in order to secure passage of the bill.

I had hoped that the committee would come in with a bill which could be acceptable. However, there is a strong feeling among many of us that, once the bill has passed the House, a conference committee of the two Houses will rewrite the bill in accordance with the dictates of the administration and the Pentagon.

It is my firm belief that we should have a complete, well-thought-out proposal on which to vote. I believe there is a common meeting ground where there can be developed reasonable and proper legislation. I feel that there should be strong civilian influence in any permanent military program. I do not desire to see complete militarization. I believe that a law should be established whereby a young man, submitting himself to the service of his country, should be given some choice.

Congressman CHARLES P. NELSON, of Maine, a member of the Armed Services Committee and a reserve officer in our Army, made a significant statement in his speech yesterday, and I quote:

If we pass this legislation, we create a privileged draft-exempt class of 60,000 out of 800,000 boys who train for 6 months and then go into the Ready Reserve to be called for periods in excess of 30 days only in such number and manner as Congress may indicate. The other 740,000 remain subject to draft and to 2 years of active duty. One inequity does not cure another.

An effective ROTC training program is operating successfully in numerous colleges throughout our country. If the ROTC has been adequate to train officers for our Army, it surely can train a buck private. Through this type of training, the young men would be permitted to continue their college education.

Others might desire to join the National Guard which no one can claim is not equal, or superior, to the present plan as far as training our young men.

Even those who might have religious scruples and are entirely pacifist could not complain if they were taught civilian defense, nursing, and the other requirements which would be necessary to have in case of atomic war and an invasion of our country.

These are some of the thoughts that many of us hold should be considered in a bill of this type. Furthermore, my very strong feeling is that the young men inducted under such a program should be kept as near home as possible. I believe that the Reserve officers and the reservists in our country could be available for teaching our young men the rudiments of war under better conditions, and more economically, than shipping the young men from one end of our country to the other.

During the coming week, we will be confronted with the political strategy of the proponents to water the bill down, in order to secure its passage. The question arises, Are we conscientiously able to enact just any bill, so long as it provides UMT in some form, or are we to insist upon a bill being drafted which is feasible, equitable, and as nonconflicting as possible with our American principles of individual freedom?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, as one whose forebears who sought the shore of America to avoid the very thing we are asked to support today, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record. I am against this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 5904, now before the House for consideration, commonly called the UMT bill, proposes to establish in the United States, for the first time in our history, compulsory military training.

We are importing this idea from Europe. It kept that continent in turmoil and war for a thousand years. It never prevented a war nor saved a nation from the ravages of war. It is repugnant to every principle of freedom upon which our country was founded.

Must we surrender liberty by adopting compulsory military training? This bill proposes just that. I am opposed to the principle involved.

My own father was sent to America at the age of 15, and one of the reasons was to avoid 7 years of peacetime conscription in the Italian Army.

Hitler adopted it. It destroyed him. Oddly and ironically enough, the powers that destroyed him and his compulsory military training machine were mainly nations which never adopted that principle—England and our own country, in particular.

We are told that compulsory training over a period of 6 months, and liability to military service for a period of 7½ years thereafter, for every American boy of 18 years who is in reasonably good physical condition, is just because all are treated alike.

We are told that this bill will solve our military manpower problem once and for all.

We are told that such a tremendous reservoir of trained men would be created that all other nations in the world, including our present enemy, would not dare start a war of any kind; much less attack the United States.

This compulsory military training is presented in the guise of a guaranty of world peace now and forever.

We are told that the existence of a huge trained military reserve would enable this country to avoid the necessity of keeping up a large standing Army.

It is proposed that for every three men receiving military training and entering the Reserve, one man should be dropped from the ranks of the standing Army.

Thus they would have us believe that this program in the end would cost American taxpayers far less than maintenance of an adequate standing Army.

We are told also that such a program would almost at once eliminate the necessity of recalling into service veterans who presumably have done their share of fighting.

After telling us all these things, the supporters of universal military training tell us that compulsory service for every physically capable boy of 18 years would improve the health and morals of all our young people.

They enlarge upon the benefits accruing to every young man from a period under military discipline.

Taken altogether, it is a pretty convincing argument, on the surface at least. The only trouble with it is that the entire argument is based upon false assumptions.

Somewhere it has been said that an expert is one who avoids minor mistakes while sweeping on to the major fallacy.

This is exactly the case with respect to the argument for this peacetime conscription presented by experts in the Pentagon.

Its supporters assume that forcing a young man to do something against his will somehow becomes just, if all young men are forced to do the same thing.

Is slavery right, if a whole nation is enslaved? Are the conscripted legions of Russia proof that Russia is a republic?

It seems to me that our American form of government is built around the idea of voluntary participation. If a truly free nation finds itself compelled to demand military service of its young men, that nation does so unwillingly.

Suspension of civilian processes for those who serve, in order to make way for the complete regimentation and the ironclad caste system of the military, is limited strictly to the duration of the emergency.

The truth of this is totally unrelated to the fact that after both world wars the Federal administrations in power underestimated the extent of the emergency and demobilized too soon.

But those who support this measure would subject all our 18-year-old boys to this regimentation in times of peace as well as in times of emergency.

Not only would they subject every able-bodied boy to military discipline for 6 months, but they would render him liable momentarily for 7½ years to suspension of his civil rights.

The years, let me say, when a boy normally learns his trade or profession, and establishes a home.

I wish somebody would tell me where democracy lies in all this. Military training and liability to military service at the whim of some ambitious officeholder, or even of a professional military group, is an evil to be avoided.

It is an evil to be tolerated and endured in times of great emergency, but never to be embraced in times of peace.

Quite as fallacious as any other part of the argument for universal military training is the assertion that it would create a vast reservoir of trained military manpower.

Experience has shown that 6 months of military training is more than enough to make a good soldier, capable of fighting at top efficiency and of taking care of himself in the field.

But experience has shown, too, that weapons and equipment, and even military techniques, change so fast nowadays that only a few months after discharge a soldier's knowledge and skills become largely obsolete.

Not entirely obsolescent, perhaps, but enough so that after a short time in civilian life the individual has to be trained all over again.

Then what becomes of the vast reservoir of trained military manpower? How would compulsory military training

solve our military manpower problem once and for all?

The answer to this question of military manpower consists, I believe, of a comparatively small and highly trained standing army, a strong navy, and an even stronger air force.

On this basis, army, navy, and air force personnel could and should comprise largely volunteers, supplemented only as required by the draft.

Such striking forces, highly trained and well paid, would be the best guaranty of our national safety. And why is this so?

The art and science of warfare has changed, even since World War II. The terrific losses among massed Chinese Communist troops, in combat with a comparatively few Americans in Korea, has demonstrated that fire power is vastly more important than numbers.

Some military experts now are convinced that in future land warfare will consist almost entirely of so-called guerrilla-type operations, with small groups of men engaged.

The tendency toward this kind of mobile warfare became obvious early in World War II, and even before that in the Chino-Japanese war, and the civil war between Chinese Nationalists and Communists.

How was it, I may ask, that thin lines of American troops were able to take the heavily fortified islands of the Pacific? Was it not because of their tremendous fire power, as compared with the fire power of the Japanese defenders? That, and the heroism of American boys?

The notion that a huge armed force reserve would act as an effective deterrent of war is just as false as any of the other assumptions on which the case for universal military training is built.

The principle in this bill never prevented war among the majority of European nations which used this method of building up military reserves over many generations.

Instead, it is true that compulsory military training served only to build up tensions, and encourage armament races, which have kept Europe at war much of the time during the past centuries. Twice in a single generation the United States has been dragged into these general wars.

In this connection, it should be said that one of the first things done by Emperor Hirohito, when the Japanese Government was reconstructed, under the guidance of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, was to do away with compulsory military training.

The Japanese learned the hard way that such training merely strengthens a military caste, to the point finally when the military is strong enough to force the nation into aggressive adventures abroad.

Compulsory military training never has guaranteed victory for any nation in recent historical times. Germany suffered defeat in two world wars; Japan in one. Italy suffered disgraceful defeats in Ethiopia and Greece, as well as in World War II.

The nations which won, if any can be said to have won, in both World War I and World War II, were Great Britain

and the United States. Neither has ever resorted to that type of military training.

Arguments that it would eliminate the necessity of keeping up a large standing army merely beg the question. We neither want nor need a large standing army.

The creation of a vast Reserve, which would have to be retrained periodically in any event, would not remove the necessity for that comparatively small and highly trained army of which I spoke; and, in fact, might easily prevent the maintenance of that small and efficient army.

This measure, now before the House, would make it impossible to draft boys taken for training.

Those who might otherwise have volunteered for the Army, Navy, and Air Force would be in universal military training camps. They would be ineligible for the draft. It is easy to imagine how many, who would avoid military service altogether, or would delay it as long as possible, would find a haven of refuge.

It has been stated in this debate that forced military training would save American taxpayers at least \$13,000,000,000. I fear this is but a hope.

Pentagon estimates put the first year's cost at \$4,187,983,600 for training an average class of 800,000 boys of 18 years, and the recurring annual cost at \$2,158,746,200.

Possibly the \$13,000,000,000 mentioned would be the cost of drafting and training a huge army on the eve of an emergency. I do not concede that such an army ever again will be necessary.

But if such an emergency should arise, and the need for a great army of foot soldiers should arise with it, would it not be better to spend the \$13,000,000,000 than to spend \$100,000,000,000 over the next 50 years for a largely useless armed reserve?

I say this because it has been the experience everywhere that, once established, compulsory military training becomes permanent, at least until it is destroyed through utter military defeat, as in the instance of Japan and Germany.

In conclusion, I am perfectly willing to agree that military training of any kind worthy of the name may harden and toughen a boy's physique. I doubt if it improves the general level of his health.

I am completely unwilling, however, to go along with those who say that military training improves the moral status of anyone at all. In spite of the utmost care by military authorities, the moral atmosphere of an Army camp never can compare with that of the average American home.

Anyone that ever has lived in or near an Army camp of any kind knows the truth about this. Let us defeat this bill and keep this European idea away from the shores of America.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY].

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, for many years I have been actively connected with the National Guard of the

United States. I was a part of the guard back in the days when it was in every phase a State guard and later when it became a federalized guard. I have served as an enlisted man and as a commissioned officer. I have served actively in one campaign and in one war, being discharged during the Army maneuvers of 1940 for a physical disability, while commanding an infantry brigade. For many years I have lived, believed in, talked, and thought as a citizen soldier. I have seen them all, some well trained, some fairly trained, others whose state of training needs no mention here.

From the days of World War I, I have become convinced that some form of universal military training would, in a great measure, assist in an adequate military preparedness. I envisioned the time when, in addition to the forces of the Regular Establishment, we would have a strong reserve of citizen soldiers, consisting of the National Guard of the several States and the organized reserves. We hoped that the time would come when a system of training would be adopted which would channel into the guard and the Reserves sufficient numbers of men, by compulsory measures, to give to our defense an efficient, well-trained, and operating reserve; a guard and a Reserve in actuality and not a paper one. On this subject, from the end of World War I, I have spoken in favor all over our country.

For a whole week, many Members of the House have spoken on H. R. 5904, a bill to provide for the administration and discipline of the National Security Training Corps and for other purposes.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with interest to my colleagues, who have spoken either in favor of or against the bill now under consideration. I admire and respect each and every one of them for their views and opinions, whether they agree with mine or not. I hope that my colleagues in return, will give me the same consideration in my thoughts and I know they will.

I have talked with many Members of the House since the debate started and I find, as is usual, a great variety of answers. I am frank in saying not once have I talked with any Member who looked upon this bill and the debate, which naturally followed, as a political question. While I am on this subject, let me state here and now that I am not interested in the views of any group commonly known as a pressure group, which organize from time to time simply to be for or against certain legislation suiting their own selfish views. Neither am I interested in that organization or organizations which uses a club over a Member's head to be for or against this bill or the Member's political future will be at stake.

No, Mr. Chairman, this question is too all-enhancing and too important to heed the voices of those who, while urging either passage or defeat of the measure, know very little of the bill itself—outside of the title.

Personally, I have many objections to the bill in its present form. I have searched for the answers, but regardless of the assurances of some of my col-

leagues, I am not convinced that all is well.

Mr. Chairman, as I have already stated, in my opinion, the theory of universal military training is to provide the country with a well-trained reservoir of manpower ready at notice to take their places in the Armed Forces in the defense of our country.

In my humble opinion, the bill under consideration, will not do those things necessary for the establishment of a trained, efficient, and disciplined reserve, unless it be materially amended.

I am terribly concerned over the future of the National Guard under the terms of this bill, and, while I have been assured by some of my colleagues, that the enactment of this legislation will benefit the Guard as a whole, I bring to your attention the testimony of Maj. Gen. Ellard A. Walsh, president of the National Guard of the United States before the Armed Services Committee in the hearings on pages 2852 and 2853, and I quote the questions asked by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] and the general's answers:

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. General Walsh, as I understood the testimony, you believe that if the bill is passed that is now before us, without amendment, it would ultimately mean the end of the National Guard?

General WALSH. Exactly.

The CHAIRMAN. Why?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. It would mean the end of the National Guard ultimately.

General WALSH. Exactly. If all the other reserve groups, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, are going to have this product channeled into those calls, and we are to get none, then it is the end.

Mr. Chairman, what the General meant, as I understand his testimony would mean the end of the National Guard. In passing, let me say to you, that I know of no citizen-soldier who has a more distinguished record or one who knows the subject of national defense as well as General Walsh, for years president of the National Guard Association of the United States and adjutant general of the State of Minnesota. I am proud to call him friend and to have served in the National Guard with him.

Following the above the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, asked General Walsh the following questions and again I quote:

The CHAIRMAN. Let me clear up one question that the General answered to Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. CUNNINGHAM said if this bill passes like it is, what effect it has on the National Guard, and the General answered that is the end of the National Guard.

General WALSH. In due course.

The CHAIRMAN. What?

General WALSH. In due course.

The CHAIRMAN. In what?

General WALSH. In due course.

The CHAIRMAN. In due course. Well, I would like to know—you have been getting along pretty well for the last 20 years when we didn't have any law like this on the statute books.

General WALSH. We didn't have any UMT during the past 20 years, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I believe after the colloquy between the Chairman and General Walsh, there should be no doubt in the minds of any Member as to what

will happen to the National Guard. For your further information, let me say that the guard has been kept alive solely through the efforts of patriotic citizens all over our country who have sacrificed much in time and financial return to do their bit in the interests of national defense. The guard has been belittled by some professional soldiers and many have looked down their noses at it, but I do not know what might have happened in both World War I and World War II if it had not been for certain National Guard divisions, incompletely trained as they were. All one has to do to find the answer—is to consult the record.

Mr. Chairman, under the sections of the bill we are discussing, there is no compulsion to channel men into the guard of the several States. I have been advised by some Members that under the Constitution it could not be done, due to the fact that the guard is under control of the several States. Nonsense. From many lawyers well versed in constitutional law, I have been advised that it could be done. Perhaps some in the Military Establishment do not care to do so. Some would rather see the guard go out of existence. The answer to that thought is obvious. On this I would like to quote the questions and answers occurring on page 2854 and page 2855 of the hearings, which follow:

The CHAIRMAN. Then put it this way: You are advocating that to keep the National Guard up to the 399,500 that we write into this bill that a trainee can be ordered by the Department into the National Guard or any other unit?

General WALSH. If the Congress gives them the authority.

The CHAIRMAN. If Congress gives them the authority to order them in there.

Colonel STEVENSON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Notwithstanding the fact that it is a State organization.

Colonel STEVENSON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And the State controls it and it is under strict State control.

Mr. BLANDFORD. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question there? General, isn't that implying, therefore, that a man who is inducted into the Armed Forces or into the National Security Training Corps can constitutionally be required to assume a dual status?

Colonel STEVENSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANDFORD. In other words, you assume that the Constitution permits a man to be inducted into a State National Guard?

Colonel STEVENSON. Absolutely.

Mr. BLANDFORD. And to answer a State call for any service required of him by the Governor?

Colonel STEVENSON. Yes.

Mr. BLANDFORD. And at the same time the other man who goes into an Organized Reserve unit is only subject to serve the Federal Government. So the man who goes into the National Guard under your proposition is subject to two calls?

Colonel STEVENSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANDFORD. He can be called even in the event there is no emergency by the Governor of the State for as long a period as the Governor wants to call him. The man who goes into the Reserve unit can only be called in such numbers as the Congress may hereafter determine.

General WALSH. Absolutely right, Mr. Blandford.

Mr. BLANDFORD. Isn't that giving the man who goes into the National Guard a tremendous responsibility as compared with the man that goes in the Organized Reserve?

Mr. BROOKS. Gentlemen, that has always been the case with the National Guard under the volunteer system.

General WALSH. Yes, sir.

Mr. BROOKS. You always had that dual responsibility.

Mr. BLANDFORD. On a voluntary basis.

Mr. BROOKS. If you still give him the right to elect to go in the guard and you count that service, knowing their pride in Louisiana—

General WALSH. We are only talking about UMT. We are not talking about any other law.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right.

General WALSH. And our only concern is with the product of UMT.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. Let's follow that: With the product of the UMT. The trainee after he has had 6 months' training, then he goes into some Reserve organization. You want it written into the bill that the Department of Defense can order him into the National Guard if it so sees fit to?

Mr. JOHNSON. If the State agrees to it.

The CHAIRMAN. Wait. Is that correct?

General WALSH. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Then do you want to put in there provided it is agreeable to the State?

General WALSH. With the consent of the governor, as you specified in the National Defense Act.

The CHAIRMAN. If you put that in there, then it is all right. We will take a recess—

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Just a moment, Mr. Chairman. General Walsh, shouldn't there be a definite percentage, however, so you will be sure you have your strength in the National Guard.

Mr. JOHNSON. Isn't that what it amounts to? They delegate him to serve the Reserve service in the National Guard.

General WALSH. And give him some incentive for accepting that dual obligation.

Mr. Chairman, I know the trials and tribulations of a company, regimental, and brigade commander of a National Guard division. I know how hard it is to get recruits and I know of the many hours, days, weeks, and months, year in and year out, spent in trying to keep an outfit up to authorized strength. It is hard enough to do the job when all work as a team and pulling for the same goal, but it is tough and heartbreaking when forces are at work to strangle one part of your Reserve components. If you intend to have an efficient, well-trained, up-to-strength National Guard, you must do this by compulsion, not volunteer methods. You cannot keep the guard or the Reserves up to strength after the completion of an individual's 6 months' training unless he is compelled to actually serve some portion of his reserve time. If you do not and the individual completes his 6 months' training and then returns to his home, simply waiting out his Reserve period, passage of this bill will be more than useless. It will be a fraud upon the boys who have served their 6 months and it certainly will be a fraud upon the taxpayers of our country.

It has been said on the floor of this House that amendments will be offered to take care of these omissions or deficiencies in the bill. May I respectfully ask why they were not put in this bill originally? Why was not a bill written which would remove the doubts many of us have. Why was this bill left for amendments to be added under the 5-minute rule? Was it to sweeten up the measure as reported from the committee? For me these things I have spoken

of must be in the bill. I will not leave anything to chance. Only a few days back, in answer to some of my questions, I was assured that these matters concerning the Reserves were all taken care of in a bill which passed the House, I believe, October 1951. In this connection may I call the attention of the membership to the fact that the other body up to the present moment has not as yet taken up this bill.

No, Mr. Chairman; there is much to be desired in this bill and its timing. Do not believe for 1 minute that all the commissioned personnel of the Armed Forces are for it at the present time. They are not. Do not believe for a minute that all veterans are for the bill. They are not. I know, I have talked with many in and out of the services. Many noted military experts also add their disapproval. One in particular, Hanson Baldwin, believes that UMT would be a definite handicap to the national defense. That is the view held by many high-ranking officers of the Army and Navy. Regardless of what people may say or think, regardless of what they say of our action in Korea, we are at war and make no mistake about it. That being so, we are going to have the continuation of the draft with us for some time to come. Today it is not so much the training of large masses of military manpower, but the immediate production of planes, tanks, guns, and the training of specialists.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take up the time of the committee in going over many of the same arguments used on preceding days. That has been well taken care of by others of my colleagues.

Suffice for me to say that I shall have to vote for recommitment and bring back a bill that many of us who want to can vote for.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON], a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to a universal military training program in peacetime, provided its application is universal. The plan outlined in the bill now before us, however, is not to be deferred until we are at peace; neither is it universal. There was nothing in the bill passed last year that could possibly be construed as requiring the institution of a UMT program at this time.

If my recollection serves me correctly, the legislation we passed last year was adopted on the representation that it merely authorized the submission of a plan which should become effective when we were no longer at war. Universal military training is inherently a peacetime precaution. Until recently I cannot remember that anyone urged that it be put into operation during wartime or during the time when we are required to raise any part of our Armed Forces through selective service.

I submit that selective service and universal military training are wholly inconsistent. While we are engaged in hostilities they violently conflict with each other. The use of both systems simultaneously cannot help but impair

our war effort rather than aid in its prosecution.

If you will examine the hearings, which were held before our committee, you will find that General Hershey and others indicated what I believe is obvious to all of us: that trainees in the National Security Training Corps and those men taken from selective service for military training and service come from the same pool. The fact that trainees in the corps are inducted before they reach the age of 19 while those inducted under the Selective Service Act are not called until later is a meaningless distinction as all are required to register under the Selective Service Act. If boys are channeled into UMT a few months before they might be drafted, it merely follows that fewer men are available under selective service. It is not much of an argument that persons may be inducted into UMT at the age of 18 but cannot be drafted under selective service until they reach 18½ years.

So, we face the situation of one boy being inducted under the universal military training program, whereas another boy with the same qualifications, with the same background, and virtually of the same age is inducted under selective service perhaps only a few days or weeks thereafter. In the former case the boy serves 6 months in a training camp within the United States. In the latter case the draftee would be required to serve for a period of 24 months, during which period he may be required to serve overseas and in combat. What is universal about that kind of system?

Let us go a step further and see how it works out. Does the boy who goes into the UMT program enter into the military service at the end of his 6 months of training? He does not. He is no longer in the selective service pool. He cannot be drafted. The selective service pool is necessarily reduced to the extent boys are inducted under UMT. To that degree the war effort is actually interfered with.

It will be claimed, of course, that the UMT trainee after his 6 months of training becomes a reservist subject to call for military service for 7½ years. The boy who is drafted also becomes a reservist at the end of his 24 months of service, the only difference being that he is subject to call as a reservist for 6 additional years instead of 7½. As neither can be recalled to active duty without action of Congress, it follows that the boy who goes into UMT is through in 6 months unless an emergency develops serious enough to warrant action by Congress.

It will be noted that the bill before us provides that a young man may enlist in the National Security Training Corps. Thus selective service may be circumvented by the simple process of being accepted for enlistment in the corps. What better proof is required that UMT cannot work during wartime or function while selective service is in operation? Universal military training cannot be successful so long as it can be made a haven for draft dodgers. Nor can it succeed if an agency of the Government can assign one man to 6 months of basic

training within the United States and another to basic training and military service for 24 months.

I am sure you will agree with me that it has not been easy to sell compulsory military service to the American people. Only the gravest emergencies have made it possible to go as far as we have. Under selective service there is no favored class. Errors of judgment may be committed by draft boards, but so far as the law itself is concerned, exemptions and deferments apply equally to all who are entitled to be exempted or deferred. Not so with universal military training, however, as it is defined in this bill. Trainees as well as those drafted into the military service must be equally qualified for military service from the standpoint of physical fitness and otherwise. One boy, however, is taken out of the selective-service pool upon the completion of 6 months of training while another with exactly similar qualifications is drafted for 24 months and may be required to serve in combat. What do you suppose the reaction would be to this type of discrimination on the part of the draftees and their families?

This bill is strangely silent as to how selections are to be made—obviously because no fair method can be devised. The American people have demonstrated time and time again that they are willing to make any sacrifices in the interest of national defense and the preservation of our American institutions, but they are opposed—and they have the right to be opposed—to any law which would give special privileges and set up a favored class. This bill does exactly that, and so long as UMT and selective service are in force at the same time, I know of no amendment which would correct the situation.

This phase of the bill is not only unfair and discriminatory, but it fails to meet American standards. No principle of law is better settled than the one that laws must have universal application. Along with freedom itself our founding fathers sought to guarantee equal and exact justice for all persons.

I cannot agree with those who say that we are already discriminating against the young men of the country because we draft men of 19 but not those who are 18. The situation we face here is not comparable at all. Under the Selective Service Act all boys of 18 know that they will be subject to induction when they reach the age of 18 years and 6 months. Under the pending bill the 18-year-old boys who get into the UMT program cannot be drafted when they reach the age of 18½ years. Those who fail to get into the program can be drafted. What could be more unfair or more discriminatory?

Not a syllable of testimony was offered to the effect that this proposed legislation is necessary to win the Korean war or to meet the present crisis or any crisis foreseeable at this time. It is argued that the law is needed for the period when it is safe to reduce our Armed Forces. When that time will be nobody knows. Obviously it cannot be soon; probably not for a number of years to come. Pending the arrival of that time the

American people have been called upon for sacrifices bordering on the confiscation of their property and their income, to say nothing of the greater sacrifices made by those who have offered their all to preserve freedom in the world.

I do not believe it takes a mathematician to determine that the institution of universal military training at this time will burden the American taxpayer with additional billions per year. More than \$4,000,000,000 for the first year and a recurring annual cost of more than \$2,000,000,000 are conservative estimates.

In view of the comment already made in this debate on the subject, you are not likely to be deluded by the figures outlined by our distinguished chairman. Obviously, his calculations are based upon conditions which may never occur, or at least will not occur for a considerable number of years. Who can say when we will again be at peace? Who can say when it will be safe to reduce our Armed Forces or cease building for our defense? Who knows how long we shall be required to contribute to our military-aid programs throughout the world?

Needless to say we can ill afford to taken on an additional burden if we do not have to—particularly one the cost of which for the first year alone will exceed \$4,000,000,000.

I submit that no logical reason has been given for instituting universal military training now. Dollars needlessly spent necessarily impair our national security. Some of the advocates of this bill have pointed out that the Communists are against universal military training. On the other hand it is a well known fact that it is the fervent hope of Communist leaders that this Nation founder on the rocks of national insolvency. Certainly the expenditure of billions of dollars necessary to institute and carry out this program will not improve our fiscal condition. The time has come when we must do without that which we can do without. We cannot do without the guns and tanks and planes and other things immediately necessary in the interest of national security. We can do without universal military training until international conditions change for the better. We did not undertake to build up our present armed strength with any dependence upon a universal military training program.

We are building it up because of the threat of communism which faces this Nation and the world. So long as that threat exists we cannot substitute a peacetime training program for the armed strength we need now and will need in the foreseeable future. Universal military training cannot be instituted at this time without seriously interfering with our preparedness program. It can be instituted when that program ceases. That is the time to do it; not now.

On this connection I see nothing inconsistent in the position of those who voted for the universal military training bill last year and those who might seek to recommit this measure or to vote against it. There is no inconsistency because there was nothing in the bill last year that indicated in any way, shape,

or form when the program should be instituted. As a matter of fact the representation was made last year, and I believe many Members acted upon it, that the bill then before us was a peacetime measure and that no plan would be instituted until peacetime conditions justified it. How absurd it is, therefore, for anyone to contend that Congress would be shirking its duty if it does not pass this bill now.

I have no sympathy for the plea that if we do not act during wartime we will not act later on. I believe it is our duty to consider with great caution any peacetime proposal which requires war hysteria to put over.

I was one of the seven Members of the Armed Services Committee to vote against this bill in committee. I am still against it and I do not believe that it can be amended so as to make it acceptable at this time. The advisable course appears to be to recommit the bill so that the program may be taken up at a more appropriate time.

If we vote to recommit this bill, or if we vote against it, the Commission can later on submit another plan. There is no limitation upon the number of plans the Commission may submit. If this bill is recommitted the Commission, of course, will later on submit another plan. When that time comes either this Congress or some other Congress will have the opportunity to pass upon the merits of the plan in light of conditions as they exist at that time. At that time Congress will be in a far better condition to judge of future plans than we are at this time. So I submit the proper and appropriate course is to recommit this bill so that later on Congress may consider another plan.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield to my good friend the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I have asked the gentleman from Ohio to yield at this time, first of all, to congratulate him on the very able statement and address that he just delivered; second, to say to the House that the gentleman from Ohio has announced he will not be a candidate for reelection, and that we are all very sorry to lose his services here in this body. I wish to compliment him upon the great work that he has done in rewriting the military justice code of the United States and the other contributions he has made to the welfare of his country.

Mr. ELSTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SHORT. May I say that not only is the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON] an outstanding lawyer but he is one of the most valuable members of the Committee on the Armed Services and we all regret having him leave us.

Mr. ARENDS. May I say a hearty amen to what the gentlemen have just said. I thoroughly agree with all they have said.

Mr. ELSTON. I am flattered and I thank the gentlemen.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, it was with regret that I received the information sometime ago that the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON] would not seek reelection. During the

years I have served on the Committee on Armed Services, I know of no Member who has rendered more outstanding and distinguished service than has the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON]. The House will truly miss a great lawyer and a great legislator.

Mr. ELSTON. May I say in thanking the gentleman from Georgia that one of the most pleasant and profitable incidents of my service in the House has been the privilege of serving under his distinguished leadership as chairman of the great Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, in my considered judgment any program of the nature of universal military training which is not supported by mothers and fathers, religious leaders and educators of this country cannot long be successful.

From listening to the debate on the floor for the past 4 days, it is obvious that many Members of this House have reached a conclusion on this issue, and some are adamant in their opinions. All I ask at this time is that you reserve as much judgment as possible until there is opportunity for me to offer an amendment in the form of a substitute bill, which I think will remove many of the objections which have been voiced here and many of the objections of the people whom we represent.

I propose to substitute for this measure, a bill which would place the administration of the program in our senior and junior colleges. Now I know that there will be experienced a great many difficulties in such an experiment, but this entire idea is one of trial and error, although we are dealing with great fundamentals and deep philosophies. But if mistakes are made, they will be greatly mitigated, regardless of what they may be, if these boys who become subject to military training, are under the jurisdiction of school officials of our senior and junior colleges.

Of course, someone is going to raise the question immediately that every boy subject to such training will not be eligible for college work. Others will remind us that there will be those boys who are not desirous of becoming candidates for a college degree or who do not have the prerequisites for entering college. These boys will have the opportunity of taking vocational courses which can be provided by such schools. It will give educational opportunity to many who may not otherwise have them, and I think such a program can be inaugurated with a much less expenditure than under the present system proposed. Any program of this nature is going to be expensive.

The measure I wish to present will extend training for 9 months, or an entire school year, plus 3 months' field training in the summer. This is a compromise for those who believe that adequate and complete training cannot be fully received in the schools. From my

experience and observation, I doubt seriously that very much training could be had as provided in the present measure, and if we are going into such a program, I think we should go far enough to really accomplish a full measure rather than an exposure to military indoctrination.

I would leave rather wide discretion with the Commission provided in the Vinson bill to contract with the schools, and make sure that no Federal authority attach to them, but that the military end of it be supported by the Government, and that the instructors for all intents and purposes become a part of the faculty of such institutions.

This is a very sketchy explanation of what I shall suggest in my substitute bill, but I trust you will give consideration to these salient points prior to such time as you may be called upon to act on them.

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Chairman, by Public Law No. 51, Eighty-second Congress, a National Security Training Corps was created. This was approved and became law June 19, 1951. In this present consideration of H. R. 5904 this body is merely seeking to provide a law for the problems of administration and discipline for the National Security Training Corps. This is as was promised at the time of the consideration of H. R. 2811 last summer. I am in favor of this National Security Training Corps as set up in Public Law 51 and for its full and immediate implementation substantially as provided in H. R. 5904.

This is no new idea with me. It has been a conviction since I was in high school and caused my choice of a college with a military department. Thomas Jefferson's often-quoted words, "We must train and classify the whole of our male citizens," had new and greater significance after I saw our raw recruits go into battle in World War I. The policy of unpreparedness in the years since has confirmed my early belief in the right and duty of every American youth to military training.

It may be unfortunate that the name "universal military training" has been given to this law and plan. An unfounded stigma in the minds of many sincere and religious people exists in that name. They express it in such phrases as "saddling the American people with a permanent military system." They quote out of context Washington's statement that we should "avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments." Why is this law any more permanent than any other passed by this or previous Congresses? Certainly George Washington was speaking of a large standing army and not a trained militia, which he strongly favored. If we had adopted this plan in 1946, we could have a classified and partially trained Reserve of from 3,500,000 to 5,000,000 men today. With this Reserve force, the battle-worn veteran of

World War II would not have been called back to fight in Korea. With that kind of a Reserve a standing army of half the size of our present establishment would be adequate.

From these trainees there could have been drawn the specialists who are so essential in modern warfare and whom we seek for so frantically in our haphazard mobilization. When the men in the Kremlin know that we have a trained Reserve of three to five million men, and you may be sure they will know it, a new respect for our Government's diplomatic demands will arise.

I am sure that we cannot insure a world of law and order by arms alone. But without a consistent and definite plan on a long-time basis we cannot even be sure of the safety of our own country. This general plan offers the best chance of holding back Communist aggression over a period of years. During this time the United States, joined with other freedom-loving people, will have the greatest opportunity of all time to build a world of law and order.

It is unrealistic to believe that 13 men in the Kremlin can indefinitely continue to control the minds and bodies of 800,000,000 people against their will. If we can hold back the starting of world war III for a few years and match our military might with moral leadership we can have a new world of peace and law. Lacking either the element of strength or of moral leadership we will fail. The National Security Training Corps is in my judgment our best chance for the element of strength.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for this bill and against all crippling amendments that may be offered to it. Unlike some of those that may have been in a state of indecision, I have no apologies to make, and I do not want to be in a position of passing the buck to future Congresses or to any of those who may have to do this job in the future, a problem which I think should be dealt with unequivocally here, now, at this time. I have no hesitation in the position I take and the decision I have made.

I am convinced that the passage of this bill will add to the strength and the security of the United States of America. I am further convinced that the adequacy of our preparedness may have a direct bearing upon the future peace of the world, upon the survival of our country, and perhaps of free nations everywhere, and, for that matter, upon the question of survival of civilization itself. Assuming that this bill does offer an opportunity to give us more strength militarily over the long pull in the future years, it seems to me that it may very well be a measure the outcome of which may have a lot to do with the future course of mankind and civilization itself on this earth. I think it is just that important, and I think it is one with which freemen must consult their consciences and deal with it effectively and forthrightly while it is before us at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I suppose that no question will be presented to the House during this session of the Congress, and perhaps for many Congresses to come, that will involve a more difficult choice for many Members of this great body to make.

There is not one Member among us, I am sure, who is opposed to preparedness, nor is there one Member among us who does not fervently hope that we can reduce by \$13,000,000,000 the tremendous expenditures now involved in supporting our Armed Forces. Those who heard our distinguished chairman in his discussion of this bill on Tuesday were undoubtedly impressed by the cold facts which he presented, based upon an actual study of the tentative plan of the training program which would go into effect which, when fully effective, would bring about a saving to the American taxpayers of \$13,000,000,000 per year. That would be accomplished, as has been fully explained, through a reduction in the size of the standing forces, the degree of preparedness being transferred from the standing forces to those in the Reserves who would be subject to call in case of an emergency. We have been told that it costs about \$10,000 a year to keep a man in the armed services. Therefore, if 1,000,000 men could be taken off and the preparedness demands met through the Reserve program, which would be the program of universal military training then, of course, the saving of tremendous sums is obvious, and during this time when there is such a terrific burden being shouldered by the American taxpayers, perhaps the heaviest in peacetime history of the United States, I hardly see how anyone can blind himself to this opportunity to not only provide for more strength and security for America, but at the same time provide some tax relief for the overburdened American taxpayers.

All of us, as human beings, cannot help but respond sympathetically to the pitiful letters that each of us have received from the wives and mothers of the recalled reservists. Many Members have received scores of letters, and they know what I am talking about; the same wives and mothers who lived through the agony of World War II and are now living through the agony of Korea. The proposed bill will go far toward solving all of those problems.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. LANTAFF] discussed that feature of it very well a little while ago when he pointed out that 800,000 reservists were called into the service after the Korean conflict began. Eight hundred thousand were called into service. Why? Because there were not enough men ready and prepared to meet an emergency that had to be met at that time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. We have been in this thing now for 2 years. We had a Selective Service Act in effect that the Army could have used when this thing started. We still have a Selective Service Act in effect that the Army can use to take care of their man-

power. Yet today, 2 years after we went into Korea, and after this war was started, we still find involuntary inactive reservists in Korea, yet they are dropping the draft quota over here. That is not the fault of Congress.

Mr. FISHER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Could it be possible that the Army adopted that policy with one thing in mind, forcing on the American people a universal military training program by using the World War II reservists as a pry pole?

Mr. FISHER. I am personally convinced the answer should be no. I do not think that has any relationship whatever. That is my own viewpoint. I regret, of course, that the replacement program in Korea has not been speedier, and I feel that it should have been.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Can the gentleman tell me why we still have World War II reservists in Korea when we have had 2 years to train a drafted Army?

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman realizes, surely, that has no direct relationship to the bill before us. I have very few minutes to discuss this matter. If the gentleman would like to go into that feature with the military, suppose he go over and talk to Mrs. Rosenberg about that, along with some other things he has been consulting her about, and try to figure this thing out.

Mr. Chairman, if universal military training had been put into effect in 1946, right after the war, there would have been somewhere in the neighborhood of 2,000,000 young men, nonveterans, with 6 months' training behind them, in the Ready Reserve at the time the Korean conflict was cast upon us. Then the 800,000 reservists would not have been called upon to leave their homes, their children, and their jobs, and go back into service to fight another war, many of them after already having served from 2 to 4 years in World War II. Do you want to continue that kind of thing? Do you want to have a Reserve program in the future of a type which will perpetuate that thing, where, if there is an immediate emergency where there are not enough men in the standing forces to meet it, and not enough time to train those who have not been trained, they must reach out and pull back those who are fighting in Korea today? That issue is involved in the vote on this bill, and it cannot be escaped.

It seems to me that any piece of legislation which carries with it the obvious promise of reduced Federal expenditures, and at the same time enhances our preparedness, and—any bill which will more nearly equalize the obligation to serve the Nation—is a good bill.

This is not a new concept. UMT is not the brainchild of the Pentagon. UMT is not some insidious plot of the military leaders of the country. UMT is not inspired by a group of self-seekers. UMT is a program of preparedness that has been advocated for the past 175 years here in the peace-loving United States of America. But it has only been in the past few years that the vast majority of American citizens have

come to realize that we have no alternative but to adopt a program such as that envisioned in the bill now before us.

This is a bipartisan proposition. It is not advocated merely by the adherents of one political party. It is advocated by a majority of the American people and particularly by those who have served in the Nation's Armed Forces.

For those who would adhere to tradition, let me call your attention to a letter written by George Washington, who, while admonishing us to avoid unwieldy large standing military establishments, said at the same time to Alexander Hamilton, the chairman of a congressional committee in 1783:

It may be laid down as a primary position, and the basis of our system, that every citizen who enjoys the protection of a free government, owes not only a proportion of his property, but even his personal services to the defense of it, and consequently that the citizens of America (with a few legal and official exceptions) from 15 to 60 years of age should be borne on the militia rolls, provided with uniform arms, and so far accustomed to them that the total strength of the country might be called forth at short notice. . . . They ought to be regularly mustered and trained, and to have their arms and accoutrements inspected at certain times. . . . (and) able-bodied men, between the ages of 18 and 25 . . . drafted to form a corps in every State . . . to be employed whenever it may become necessary in the service of their country.

Those are the words of George Washington, the Father of his Country. Thomas Jefferson was quoted by one of the Members a few moments ago something along the same line. So, it is not something new that somebody has dragged out of nowhere. This idea of preparing America in this orderly manner and of creating a pool of manpower in the form of reserves; a civilian army under civilian control is nothing new. It has been advocated by the founders of our country, and those who had to do with the preservation of the whole structure of government all through the 175 years of our existence.

Let us be fair about this subject. There are some Members on this side of the aisle and many on the other side who are opposed to anything endorsed by the present administration. There are some on both sides of the aisle who take exception to practically everything recommended by the administration, and there are some who object to a majority of the things recommended by the present administration. But this is not an administration measure. This bill was written by the National Security Training Commission, headed by a Republican, the Honorable James W. Wadsworth, who served in this Congress faithfully for many years, and it was perfected by the House Committee on Armed Services.

Deep in the hearts of some military people there may be a tendency to oppose UMT. I think that the basis for that opposition was summed up very neatly by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, the ranking minority member of our committee, the Honorable DEWEY SHORT. Let me paraphrase a statement that he made last year, "I never saw a

minister who had a large enough congregation; and I never saw a general who had too many men to command." I think there is a good deal in that statement because it must be obvious to anyone who has studied this subject that we cannot have UMT on a full scale and the drafting of men for service in the Armed Forces for an indefinite period.

Obviously we cannot have a large standing force and at the same time build up a Ready Reserve of nonveterans. Thus the inevitable result of UMT will be a reduction in the size of our standing forces. The inevitable result will be a reduction in our total Federal expenditures of our Armed Forces, a good break for the American taxpayers. And the great objective, the building up of a great Ready Reserve, must naturally follow if we are to have adequate preparedness.

Now I do not see how anyone can argue with those contentions. And I do not see how anyone who wants to treat our veterans fairly can oppose this measure. It has been stated on this floor several times, but I would like to repeat again, that the only people who have a reserve obligation are those who enter our Armed Forces. Those who do not enter our Armed Forces, under present law, have no Reserve obligation. The very purpose of the proposed bill is to build up a Reserve program made up not of veterans—but of recently trained young men who have not seen prior service in the Armed Forces.

Since we know what UMT is let me tell you a few things that UMT is not: You have heard and you will continue to hear throughout this debate that UMT is conscription of the youth of America. That simply is not true. Conscription is the drafting of men for service in the Armed Forces for a period of years. UMT is a 6 months' period of training under a civilian commission.

And there are some who say that UMT will hand us over to the military. That, of course, is absurd. Who is "the military" that they are talking about. I do not know, nor do I believe the people who use that type of propaganda know. Is it the Commander in Chief? Well, he has been accused of many things but never, to my knowledge, has he harbored designs to sit in shining armor astride a white charger and be a great military hero and dictator.

Is it the Joint Chiefs of Staff? Well, their patriotism to the great ideals of our Nation has never been impeached, much less convicted of being false. And as to wanting to control the country, they certainly would not be advocating UMT under a civilian commission when they have got a draft law which gives them complete and total control over 3,500,000 young men now—and could be extended to 5,000,000 men.

Perhaps it is the Defense Department that wants to hand us over to this vague phrase, "the military." I do not know who it is in the Defense Establishment but if anybody has any facts I hope he will present them.

Perhaps these wicked military planners are people like Jim Wadsworth, the Chairman of the Commission, or Senator

RUSSELL, or Senator BYRD, or KARL LE-COMPTÉ, or the distinguished and well-loved chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, CARL VINSON. Well, that's too fantastic to even discuss. Just who makes up this military monster that is supposed to devour us if this bill passes?

Now we are told by some opponents that UMT would bring havoc to our morals. I noted with interest the reaction of our veterans organizations to this slander. They are indignant at the clear implication that because they had military training while preparing to defend their country that they thereby became immoral. Let me ask the veterans who are sitting in the House today. Are your moral principles any different from others in your community? Do you think that your veteran constituents have weakened the moral fabric of the communities that you represent?

I am afraid that those who say that UMT will breed immorality are expressing the fear that American character is ripe for decay. Surely our churches, homes, and schools have not done such a sorry job of making our young men of 18 spiritually and morally strong. And I am convinced that these young men, under the guidance of chaplains and well-selected officers and noncommissioned officers, will continue their normal healthy development during the 6 months' training period.

We have put in the proposed measure adequate protection against the practice of prostitution. It is proper that we should do this. And we have provided adequate safeguards so that trainees will not be exposed to alcoholic beverages. These are wise precautions which, coupled with the personnel who will train these young men, will adequately protect the moral character of the men who take this training.

The men who complete this training program will return to their communities in just about the same moral state of mind as when they left—or perhaps a little better. If you don't think so—you have indicted the parents, the teachers, and the churches that nurtured their moral development before they attained 18.

During the hearings on this bill representatives of some of our American churches appeared before our committee to signal to Congress what they believe to be the virtual end of the American democratic tradition to which those same churches have contributed so much.

Those warnings must be heard and examined by all of us. The issue which called them forth was universal military training.

The first significant charge made by the religious groups against UMT was that the training program recommended by the National Security Training Commission challenges the Christian concept of citizenship. To my knowledge, the exact nature of that concept has not been stated by these church groups. It has always been my understanding that the words of Jesus—"Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's"—constitute part of the foundation for separation of church and State, and that po-

litical citizenship lies outside the domain of religious definition. Certainly there can be no doubt that the legal and political concept of citizenship includes the ultimate obligation of a citizen to defend his country. Their obligation most emphatically should carry with it the obligation to be prepared for that defense.

It is perhaps true that military indoctrination rules out sympathy for our enemies, as these religious groups say. However, when freedom of religion itself is threatened by the godless prophets and conquerors of communism, who would dare suggest that we not prepare to defend our churches? Universal military training would surely indoctrinate our young men less than conscription and service for 2 years or more and that is what we are faced with for all young men unless we have UMT so that we can begin to reduce our standing forces.

A second charge made by these churches against UMT was that such a program will discourage the creative approach to peace. They warn that the enactment of such legislation will convince the world of our war-like intent.

There is absolutely nothing in H. R. 5904 either to discourage our continued and earnest efforts in the United Nations' creative approach to peace, or to indicate our love of war to the rest of the world. The very opposite seems true.

No one has ever suggested that the U. N. with its present membership can rely on international law alone. A United Nations Army is now suffering through the indescribable winter of Korea because of the lawless acts of Russia. Unless that international organization is militarily strong, the creative effort of peace through law can never be achieved. In the absence of a truly world army, each member nation must be ready to carry out its duties under the charter, the whole spirit of which embodies this concept of readiness.

If we adopt UMT, we will be indicating to the world, not a war-like intent, but an intent to reduce our standing forces, remaining at the same time strong so that aggression and war will be discouraged.

A third major charge was that UMT will breed militarism and thereby destroy our democracy. Here again we turn to the veteran members of this body and to the veterans in our home communities and ask: Are these men militaristic? Are they unthinking robots? Has their integrity and dignity been blotted out by authoritarian military efficiency? The answers are surely obvious.

UMT adds other safeguards to the basic one of American aversion to militarism. UMT will be under civilian control. UMT means only 6 months of basic training while our present Selective Service means 2 years of service. If military training means the danger of militarizing the American mind, then surely 6 months is less of an evil than 2 or more years.

The church groups argue that UMT is not 6 months' training but 8 years of military control. This 8-year estimate includes 7½ years of Reserve service now required by law. During this Reserve service, our men will not be under mili-

tary control. They will be full-fledged civilians who train briefly and periodically in order to maintain their knowledge of how to defend themselves, their homes, their great American heritage and, I might add, their churches, in the event they must go to war. This is clearly not full military control of every man's life for 8 years.

These, then, are the major charges made by the religious groups when they testified against universal military training. I have read and studied them with great respect, as all of you have.

And I am sure that the American people under religious guidance will always maintain a morally upright posture. But I also believe the American mind, alert and vigorous in its pursuit of constitutional government, will always remain free. Our love of peace will forever dictate against our taking an aggressor role in world affairs.

Our Nation does not seek war; we seek to avoid it. I know of no program that will give us greater assurance of preparedness than the one here proposed.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the issue seems to me to be quite clear. This House either favors UMT or it opposes UMT. Each of us, I am sure, could individually write a better bill; a better report; propose a better program; and could devise a much better system. At least that has been my experience whenever the compulsory use of manpower has been in issue before the House. But I hope that the little minor objections that each of us may have, which are not shared by the other Members, will not destroy this great effort to bring better preparedness at far less cost. I hope that each Member will remember his duty to all of his constituents, and not try to avoid making a decision on this crucial matter.

This bill, this program, is the result of much study—study that started 175 years ago. I sincerely hope that those who favor UMT will not try to take both sides of the issue by saying that they advocate some kind of UMT—but not this kind.

There is not any alternative to this program. There is not any easy way out. We are not going to be able to depend upon high school students, or those who want military training, to take the place of our large standing forces.

The plain facts are cold and unrelenting. We can initiate UMT with 6 months of honest, unmitigated, non-sugar coated military training, or we can continue the drafting of men for 24 months of service in the Armed Forces.

There is no easy way out. You are either for it or against it. The Nation has a right to know where you stand.

Mr. Chairman, the American people are often ahead of the Congress, and this is no exception. Every Gallup poll in recent years has shown the vast majority of American people want UMT. I conducted a poll in my own district a year ago and one question was on UMT—whether they wanted every able-bodied young man trained for a period of 6 months. A questionnaire was sent to every voter on the rolls. I received a tremendous response—returns from 25 percent of the people. A total of 83 per-

cent answered "Yes" and only 13 percent answered in the negative.

The people have experienced unpreparedness on three occasions, and they do not want it to happen again. It is your job and mine to see to it that it does not happen again.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, my vote will be against this bill. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY CONSCRIPTION

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the argument of the proponents of universal military training rests upon fear. It was Mrs. Roosevelt who told us that fear of communism must be built up "in order to rearm." There is the false assumption that we are a nation of cowardly weaklings, continue to exist only because Stalin permits us to live.

There is the fear, created by false propaganda, that communism under Stalin, expressing itself either in the form of armed might or through subterfuge, seizing control of first one government and then another, will eventually destroy our Republic.

In truth and in fact, as President Franklin D. Roosevelt once said, "We have nothing to fear except fear itself."

As always, back of every effort to change our way of life, our form of government, there are behind this drive for universal military training, sincere, patriotic individuals and groups who believe that we must contain communism within an armed ring of surpassing military power.

To talk of containing communism by armed might, either in Korea or elsewhere, is inconsistent with the long-established policy here in Washington, of not only tolerating, but encouraging Communists to hold high policy-making positions in not only the State Department, but in other Federal departments and agencies.

There are also those who engage in the production of military equipment who, as always, make their millions while war furnishes the market for their wares and the common people provide the "cannon fodder."

Again, there are today, as always, international lawyers, bankers and financiers who become multimillionaires while thousands die and nations fall. They ignore the welfare of their fellow man, they owe allegiance to no government. Their god is the dollar and their sole purpose in life seems to be the accumulation of dollars. They forget that the profits of war are, as Roosevelt said on August 14, 1936, "but fools' gold."

There are others who have lost faith in the soundness of the principles laid down in the Constitution. They have lost faith in the ability, in the courage, in the endurance of our people. They have forgotten, or they ignore, the love of freedom, the determination, the willingness to sacrifice, which sustained our

forefathers during the 8 years of the Revolutionary War.

They lack the spirit which, when Britain was mistress of the seas and we were without a Navy, inspired our seamen to win a glorious victory in the War of 1812.

They lack that devotion to principle which sustained our men of the South and those of the North during 4 years of bloody conflict when brother fought brother, each thinking he was right and which, at the end of a conflict that almost wrecked this Nation, gave us a united people. World War I saw the South and the North join in fighting a war which they then mistakenly believed would end all war.

Our forefathers came to this land to escape persecution, to escape being conscripted into the armies of their lords and masters. They knew the meaning, the results of, "taxation without representation"; of the slavery of military service imposed by those who live by war.

They went hungry and without clothing.

They walked barefoot at Valley Forge.

In winter's bitterest days they crossed the ice-clogged, dangerous Delaware under Washington.

They defeated, they captured, the militarily trained mercenary Hessians hired by King George to enslave them.

They suffered, they bled, and many of them died.

But they won for those who were left—for you and for me—the opportunity to attain the greatest degree of human liberty, prosperity, happiness, and contentment ever given to man anywhere.

Now the purpose of government is to give to the individual citizen the opportunity to obtain for himself, through work and thrift, the greatest possible degree of prosperity, happiness, contentment, freedom of thought and action—physical, mental, and spiritual development consistent with the welfare of the people as a whole.

A further necessary purpose of government is the adoption of a policy which will make certain its continued existence.

The proponents of universal military training, whatever may be their objective—and I question not the sincerity, the patriotism, nor the ability of anyone—would ignore the basic reasons which caused our forefathers to flee the Old World. They would impose upon this and future generations of America the burden of excessive, ruinous taxation necessary to support a military government.

Through involuntary military servitude they would enslave for 8 years every physically and mentally fit young American when he reached the age of 18.

They would slam shut in the face of the youth of our land the door of opportunity to a better life, ever-increasing security, which throughout the years, by adherence to the teachings of our forefathers, we have kept open.

This measure, whatever may be the purpose of its advocates, is certain to establish, to fix upon us permanently, control by the military—control not only

over the manpower of our Nation but control over civil affairs, control over our natural resources, control over our industrial system, control over transportation.

You have but to read the unification bill as first written to learn that the end of the road for those who accept universal military training—and, let me repeat, I question not their motives—is dictatorship and, human nature being what it is, tyranny.

Correspondence¹ which has come to me—as it has to all of us—from constituents gives me sound reasons why this bill should be defeated.

Until yesterday, the overwhelming sentiment of the House, as indicated by Members on the floor, seemed to insure the defeat of the bill.

But the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], a master of political strategy, apparently with the consent of the House leadership, has changed the legislative program. Instead of the bill being read beginning Monday next, under the 5-minute rule, and a vote taken within a reasonable time, as we were led to believe it would be, we now learn that an appropriation bill will be taken up

¹ Some of the objections from constituents to UMT are as follows:

Cass County Holiness Association, Cassopolis, Mich.:

"1. Universal military training will rob the American people of their faith in God, upon which the American standard and her way of life has been built, and lift up before them a false god.

"2. Universal military training will pave the road to military control, which will open the door wide to dictatorship.

"3. Universal military training will be tremendously expensive and wasteful and will create an unbearable burden on the taxpayer that ultimately will break his back, his Government, and his country.

"4. Universal military training gives a false hope of raising the moral standard, for after every war our standard has been lowered."

Michigan State Grange, overseer's office, Mount Pleasant, Mich.:

"1. It would create a military bureaucracy.

"2. It would detract rather than contribute to national security.

"3. Contrary to claims, it would be an unnecessarily costly method of defense.

"4. The majority of the people, the Grange believes, oppose it.

"5. It would not make better citizens of our young men."

Mr. and Mrs. William Jacobs, of Holland, Mich., et al.:

"1. Universal military training will not give us stronger defense than is now being built through selective service.

"2. UMT will commit us to expenditures far beyond value received.

"3. UMT would produce serious international reactions.

"4. UMT will militarize America.

"5. UMT will weaken the moral and spiritual fiber of American manhood."

The Women's Guild of the Evangelical and Reformed Church, Cleveland, Ohio, felt that UMT was permanent conscription and expressed alarm at—

1. "The growing militarism in our country," since more and more dependence is placed upon the Pentagon.

2. "The threat to the American way of life, freedom of thought and inquiry, and

Monday and be given consideration until it is disposed of.

The very apparent purpose of that strategy is to enable the military propagandists, the Legion through its Washington leadership, and perhaps other organizations of veterans to "put the heat on" Members of Congress who have announced their determination to vote against the bill.

That strategy, insofar as "putting the heat on," is working. Prior to yesterday, I had received not more than 15 wires, cards, or letters favoring the bill; hundreds urging me to vote against it.

But yesterday, petitions came in bearing the names of dozens of Legionnaires, members of auxiliaries, and perhaps 50 post cards, all carrying in substance the same message. Typical was this language: "I am in favor of UMT and urge your support of this bill."

The petitions either requested or demanded that I support "this bill."

moral strength." Military indoctrination of all men, will increase this danger.

3. "The right to have an educated youth." Under UMT this is only possible to the extent the armed services permit.

4. "The desire for positive measure for peace." The women urged "Our Government adequately to support the United Nations, and—to persist in its efforts for disarmament," both of which will be jeopardized by UMT.

Petition signed by a number of voting citizens of the United States—

"1. Universal military training is a war-breeding influence. Nearly all of the countries of the world who have had UMT have been involved in acts of aggression.

"2. UMT would not insure this country that it would be better prepared in the event of further outbreaks of war. Our unpreparedness for Korea was due to the failure of the Army to use draft laws provided by the Congress long before the outbreak in Korea.

"3. UMT would not guarantee fewer combat casualties. Statistics show that in combat, death takes the veteran and recruit in equal numbers.

"4. The training proposed under a program of this type would not mean that the country could get ready to fight more readily. The combat unit required by modern warfare would not be achieved through UMT. Access to the materials required for modern warfare would be more effective in achieving a state of readiness.

"5. UMT would cause more deaths and injuries. To the casualties of war would be added the casualties of peacetime training. In 20 years of UMT we would cause as many peacetime training casualties as we have suffered in 2 years of war with Korea.

"6. UMT is a big step toward military control of our Nation. It is this type of control which would develop a fatalistic attitude in youth that not only destroys their possible future, but rots the moral base of democratic life.

"7. UMT is not the way to beat communism. The money used to support UMT could be put to use for the defeat of communism at its roots. UMT will convince many of our allies that we really are war-minded and warmongers."

A. F. Schersten, Rock Island, Ill., for Commission on Morals and Social Relations of the Illinois Conference of Augustana Lutheran Church:

"1. It is not necessary as a military measure. A future major war would very likely be decided before UMT reserves could be ready for service. Besides, UMT would re-

I doubt very much whether very many of those urging me to vote for "this bill" ever read it, know what is in it.

Because those who have participated in other wars rendered such outstanding service to our country, I have always endeavored to support proposed legislation introduced in their behalf.

But when I am satisfied, as I am in this case—as I long have been satisfied, that the proposal is neither in the interests

move the need for a large standing army, for UMT cannot go into effect while the Army wants men for the present crisis. Furthermore, selective service provides all the men needed besides Regulars.

"2. We induct 21.2 men for each 1,000 of the population. Europe conscripts only 12.6.

"3. Nations that have had permanent UMT have had aggressive and politically powerful war machines, and have had less peace than most other nations.

"4. Permanent military training will cause a large part of the world to think that our long-range plan is not peace but war.

"5. UMT would not reduce casualties in a future war. Trained men do not have less chance of getting hit than untrained soldiers.

"6. UMT would not improve the Nation's health. Men who are physically and mentally unfit would be rejected for UMT.

"7. This military program would be far too costly. Its cost the first year would be over \$5,000,000,000, an amount equal to the present cost of all primary and secondary education in our country.

"8. UMT would mortgage several years of the lives of our youngest men. After 6 months of training they would be part of the Regular Armed Forces for over 7 years, a fact that is discreetly soft-pedaled by proponents of UMT.

"9. UMT is not necessary as a means of teaching democracy, civic consciousness, civic loyalty, manly fortitude, and self-control. We have adequate and much less expensive means of building these qualities.

"10. UMT would be morally hazardous for thousands of teen-age boys. There is no recommended legislation as to prostitution, liquor, gambling, and so forth. Thus, there is no guaranty either of sufficiently strong or of sufficiently uniform defenses against moral dangers."

A church organization writes: "No nation with UMT has ever won a war; no nation afflicted with it has ever survived. God grant that you and others who have the responsibility, will not desecrate and destroy our precious birthright for a mess of UMT pottage served up by the Military Junta in the Pentagon."

Another church wires as follows: "The Graafschap Christian Reformed Church, Route 6, Holland, Mich., representing 900 members, petitions you to oppose the proposed Universal Military Training Act. We urge you to stress that our Nation's security lies not primarily in arms, but in repentance of national sins, in the recognition of Holy God and in obedience to the principles of morality, civic righteousness, and justice set forth in Holy Scripture (Proverbs 14: 34)."

Many individuals, with pencil or pen, give the following or similar reasons:

"We are informed by the newspapers that Congress is now considering a universal military training bill. We are very much concerned about this as we still believe that our homes and our churches are the best places to train our 18-year-old boys. We still believe that America's hope lies in moral and spiritual strength and a firm belief that

of the veterans, this and future generations of my country, the welfare of our people, I cannot, however great my desire to please, support it.

Typical of the attitude of some who are not familiar with the proposal, who are unaware of its objective, who have not thought through its implication, is a letter which came to me from a grandmother yesterday morning. It reads as follows:

I am for universal military training. I have four grandsons whom I would rather be

God still is the Ruler of the Universe and not military might.

"Our young men have always rallied to the colors in time of need and we believe they will continue to do so in the future without universal military training.

"Therefore, we kindly urge you as our Member of Congress to oppose any form of universal military training."

"Against UMT. 'Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord.'"

"We believe that UMT is un-Christian and un-American. Peace cannot be attained through military force. What we need is faith in Jesus Christ. Enough faith, as a nation, to live by the moral and spiritual principles which He set forth."

"As a mother of two young boys, I wish to strongly protest the idea of universal military training in our country.

"Please do not allow the United States to become another Germany."

"Because I believe with all my heart that the UMT program would be a tragic mistake for our country to adopt, may I urge you to do all in your power to defeat it."

"We wish to urge you to vote against universal military training. We feel that the necessary manpower can be mustered through selective service. We also believe that a boy of 18 needs the influence of his home."

"We would urgently request that you oppose any form of universal military training. We believe it to be un-American and against the principles on which this Nation was founded."

"We are against the militarization of America. We believe in what it says in the Bible, 'Not by might nor by power but by My spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts.'

"To you, our Christian spokesman, we are expressing our hope and desire that you will vigorously oppose any program of universal military training."

"I wish to voice my protest on the issue of universal military training. I believe it is a backward step away from world peace and a forward step toward war. How can we ever convince the peoples of the world, the oppressed as well as those opposed to our way of thinking, that we want peace with them and for them, if we step into high gear on a military program? Then, too, if we exhaust our energies in preparation for war what strength have we left to work for peace?"

"Just this line to appeal to you to do everything in your power to oppose the adoption of any program of universal military training for this country."

"We wish to express to you, our Congressman, our disapproval of universal military

trained in case of war, and I think it would be good for girls, too; two granddaughters that could use it.

My daughter has been an Army nurse 11 years March 1, of which I am very proud.
Yours respectfully.

My reply to this woman is too long, too personal, for quotation. I assumed, however, that she was motivated by the thought which I am sure we all entertain and which is that no one should be sent to war without training.

What she and many advocates of this measure overlook is the fact that adequate training depends, not upon law, but upon the will of those in authority in the armed services. That was demonstrated during the last war when the military authorities ignored—I repeat, ignored—the specific provisions written into law by the Congress.

This grandmother does not want her grandsons to be sent to war untrained. Neither does anyone else. But it does not follow that this proposal will prevent our untrained youth fighting or dying on foreign soil.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

A decision as to whether we should adopt universal military training as our present and future national policy rests upon the correct answers to the following questions:

First, is it necessary for the continued welfare of our people, the security of the Republic?

Second, is it the most efficient way in which to serve and protect the welfare of our people, the future security of the Republic?

Third, is it the most economical way to accomplish that purpose?

Fourth, if we adopt UMT and the necessary sustaining policies, will—

(a) The freedom of the individual be lessened;

(b) Our standard of living be lowered; and

(c) Our ability to make secure the future of our Republic be destroyed?

First, Is universal military training necessary for the continued welfare of our people, the security of our Republic?

Tuesday, February 26, the chairman of the committee which reported this bill, Mr. Vinson, opened the debate with these words:

Mr. Chairman, 175 years ago this Nation embarked on a course of action that has led it to the unchallenged position of the greatest world power in the history of mankind.

On November 23, 1944, Thanksgiving Day, Winston Churchill, addressing an Anglo-American audience including

training. For the present, selective service is a satisfactory way to fill the needs of the Armed Forces. It is our belief also, that boys of 18 are too young to be drafted for service."

"The Congress is now considering a UMT bill. To us, the common people of America, this is a radical departure from the democratic American way of life to the military state which will lead to a moral, spiritual hazard and calamity, so we ask you to oppose this subtly, vicious bill."

hundreds of American servicemen, in London, said:

Americans never had more justification for thanksgiving than today "When we see that in three or four years the United States has, in sober fact, become the greatest military, naval, and air power in the world."

If we are as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson] said, the greatest world power in the history of mankind, and if we have, as Mr. Churchill said, "in sober fact become the greatest military, naval, and air power in the world," and if we are, as the pouring out of billions of dollars and millions of tons of our resources and industrial products to other countries throughout the world would indicate, the richest and most productive Nation in all the world, we cannot be the weakest, the most defenseless, Nation in the world.

We do not lack military might; we do not lack productive ability; we do not lack resources. What is it that we lack that makes us fearful? Do we lack courage? Do we lack the spirit to sacrifice in defense of home, fireside, or country?

It is not possible to, at one time, be the greatest, the strongest, the richest, the most productive and, at the same time, the weakest, most defenseless nation in the world.

That we have not heretofore lacked courage, fighting ability, or the willingness to sacrifice, is shown by the further statement of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson] which immediately followed the words which I have just quoted, referring to the fact that we now hold the unchallenged position of the greatest world power in the history of mankind. I quote:

This was achieved through sacrifice, bloodshed, and heartbreak. The war for independence, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, the War Between the States, the Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, and the current struggle in Korea, have all been challenges which our Nation has met through the common virtue of uncommon valor.

The wars to which the gentleman referred were all fought, and all were won, without universal military training. The gentleman's argument is that all might have been won sooner and with less loss had we had universal military training. There is no proof of that.

I repeat, there is no proof that, in any of those wars, victory would have come earlier or with less cost of either dollars or life had we had universal military training.

Nor should it be forgotten, as was pointed out day before yesterday by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick] and others, that World War I and World War II were fought and won against nations which have had universal military training, as will be the current struggle in Korea if Dean Acheson gets his nose out of military strategy.

Then, for good measure, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson] adds:

To defend their freedom, every generation of Americans has had to fight. Our people, composed of every nationality in the world, have never failed in their obligation as citizens to preserve this great democracy.

Does the gentleman from Georgia, do his colleagues who advocate the adoption of this measure, contend—as their arguments would seem to indicate—that the present generation of Americans lack the "common virtue of uncommon valor"; that they will fail "in their obligation as citizens to preserve this great democracy"? That I do not believe.

The war for independence was fought to establish our independence.

The War of 1812 was fought to end conscription of our seamen on the high seas by Great Britain.

The Mexican War was fought to aid the Texans in establishing their independence.

The War between the States was fought because the men of the South and the men of the North believed they were fighting for a principle.

The Spanish-American War was fought because of the sinking of the *Maine*—an act of aggression.

We were tricked into World War I and World War II because we yielded to the propaganda that the first one would end all war. The Second War was to carry the four freedoms to the end of the earth.

We are in the current struggle in Korea, which apparently is not a war we are expected to win, because we were pushed in.

In the wars preceding the one in Korea, our people fought for what they believed to be the right. Let me repeat—those wars were fought and won under the flag of our Nation by men who, at the moment, thought they were necessary for the protection of our own people and our Republic.

Today, our people believe that they have been betrayed by our Department of State. They believe that this proposed legislation is an effort to conscript the youth of America to fight under an international flag to advance the interests of some nation other than our own.

What this Nation needs to promote the people's welfare and its own security is not universal military training and millions of soldiers, but a change in our foreign policy which will end the practice of the American taxpayer being called upon to pay the cost; American youth being forced to fight in an effort not to carry the four freedoms to all the world, but to aid Britain and France, and perhaps other nations, which are attempting to hold in bondage the people in their colonial possessions who, like our forefathers, are struggling for freedom.

Universal military training is not necessary. What this Nation needs is the casting of Acheson and those of his school of thought; their replacement by clear-thinking, competent Americans, whose sole purpose will be to serve the interests of the United States of America.

Second, Is universal military training the most efficient way in which to serve and protect the welfare of our people, the future security of the Republic?

A negative answer to that question has repeatedly been given during previous debate and by what has just been said.

History records that the paid professional soldier—equipment being equal—who fights either for glory or for gain,

is never the equal, when judged by the result of combat, of the independent soldier who fights for principle, who fights because of his convictions, who fights for home, fireside, and country. No need to belabor this subject. History and experience have given the answer.

A recent article in Collier's is enlightening on this subject.²

Third, is universal military training the most economical way to protect the welfare of our people, the security of the Republic?

War is destructive and wasteful of both men, munitions, and lives.

West Point, Annapolis, and the Coast Guard Academy train men to fight and win battles and wars. No commander can win a battle or a war if cost is to limit his supply of arms and men. To win, he must have an adequate supply of both. As he cannot accurately anticipate his needs, if he is not to be defeated

he must err on the side of an abundance, not of a scarcity.

But, in addition to the natural and inevitable waste which follows war and preparation for war, great as it must be, recent congressional, nonpartisan, non-political hearings have disclosed a shock-

Mussolini and Stalin, all then in full strut, remarked that people might well be gloomy if they thought only of the moment. Little more than a decade later, the dictatorships of Hitler and Mussolini were dead.

"As Smuts said, 'The denial of free human rights must in the long run lead to a cataclysm.' Why? Because the passionate desire of men to exercise their faculties freely is a basic trait that cannot permanently be repressed. Smuts quoted Pericles: 'Happiness is freedom, and freedom is courage.' He quoted the Arbroath Manifesto of the commons and nobles of Scotland in the year 1320: 'We fight not for glory, nor for wealth, nor for honor, but for that freedom which no good man will surrender but with his life.' The South African leader stated his own conviction: 'Dictatorship can only be tolerated as a temporary expedient, and can never be a permanent substitute for free self-government. Freedom is the most ineradicable craving of human nature.'"

HISTORY GIVES PROOF

"To begin with, we have a long and melancholy history to prove that no government and no system can subjugate all Europe, much less the whole globe. Every power that has tried it has not only failed, but has half or totally ruined itself in trying. Charles V, whose motto was 'Still further', attempted to establish an Austro-Spanish supremacy over half of mankind. It was a preposterous effort. In 1544, he seemed to have Europe and Spanish America at his feet; in 1556, worn out by failures, he abdicated. * * *

"Nor was Louis XIV a whit more fortunate. * * *. He enlarged the French domains along the Rhine, seizing Strasbourg. He took a slice of Flanders. He brought a great part of Italy under his influence. Placing his grandson on the throne of Spain, he boasted that he had erased the Pyrenees. Yet the tough little Dutch nation under William III held him at bay; and when Marlborough took the field, Louis XIV met a series of defeats which * * * closed his reign in humiliation and gloom."

Napoleon and Hitler "each believed he had European dominion within his grasp." Napoleon learned "that Wellington was more than a match for any of his marshals and in the end a match for himself. Hitler discovered that even conquered lands were always ready to rise against him in a desperate war of liberation."

"One important fact to be kept in mind is this: That Charles V, Louis XIV, Napoleon, and Hitler were all betrayed by their initial successes."

"An equally important fact to be kept in mind is that it was an aroused people who threw back first Napoleon and later Hitler."

"Stalin told Anthony Eden, as Sumner Welles has lately written, that he would not make Hitler's mistake: 'I will not go too far.' The question is whether he can avoid going too far. It is difficult for the competing chiefs of the Politburo, each ambitious, each fearful of his rivals, to stop."

"Moreover, the Soviet dictatorship is caught in a nasty dilemma. If it maintains its aggressive policies, it runs the risk of war—and disaster. If it comes to terms with the West, it will lose all excuse for the vast armies, the million or more secret police, the concentration camps, and the rest of the apparatus of crisis and terror by which its power is supported."

"The second reason for our confidence in a coming Russian revolution—or a rapid

ing, shameful degree of disregard of the ability of the taxpayers to meet the armed services' demands. And more discouraging and exasperating—if that be possible—graft and corruption which, if continued, will make it impossible for our country to provide an adequate defense for the future."

Reluctantly, some of us supported a unification bill, because we were assured that it would give us economical purchasing by the armed services, a co-ordination of the Nation's natural resources and manpower which would lessen for the taxpayer the burden of our Military Establishment."

It was my contention at the time that all the objectives of that legislation could be attained without legislation by those in command if they so desired. But the legislation was adopted. Amendments

evolution with revolutionary incidents—is this: That no power has ever succeeded in holding in permanent subjection a chain of satellite countries as Russia is holding her neighbors. The situation in the East European chain of Soviet satrapies, however disguised, is essentially a revolutionary forcing-bed, which will some day blossom into widespread plots, demonstrations and uprisings."

"Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary in particular are, by a series of 5-year plans, being compelled to sacrifice culture, decent living standards and social freedom to the forced development of heavy industry, so that the Politburo can make them bear a great part of the burden of Communist armaments."

"Yet all history goes to show that such an attempt to handcuff long separate nations, no matter how seemingly helpless, must eventually break down." Examples are shown in histories of Belgium, Hungary, Poland, and Bohemia."

"In the eighteenth century the living body of Poland was torn into pieces, to be distributed among Russia, Austria, and Prussia; but its soul, as the Grand Duke Nicholas acknowledged in 1914, did not perish. So virile was the national spirit of this long dismembered people that when the First World War began, both Russia and the central powers had to promise to restore Polish unity and freedom."

"In that war the hatred of the Poles for their immemorial oppressors was so intense that one Polish force took up arms against Russia, and other Polish troops fought desperately against Germany and Austria. When the conflict ended, the reborn Polish Republic under Paderewski and Pilsudski was determined to maintain its liberty."

"Everywhere the story has been the same. Austria could not keep her grip on Venetia; England could not hold south Ireland under the crown; Turkey could not prevent the Balkan peoples from unriveting their gyves; Germany and Austria could not suppress Czech nationalism. * * *

"Among the most glorious moments in European history are those which found the Dutch 'Beggars' in revolt against mighty Spain, Kosciuszko reanimating the spirit of the Poles, Kossuth appealing to the civilized world in behalf of Hungary, Garibaldi leading his Italian legion, and the Czechs bringing their national charter from Pittsburgh. Eastern Europe is certain of seeing a repetition of these historic scenes."

The author goes on to discussing rumblings of discontent—in Hungary—among the Communists themselves; writes about Communists dominating trade-unions in Poland, exploiting—economically—the satellite states.

The author writes: "The movement for liberation may come gradually, or suddenly and violently, but it will come. Then, too,

² SUMMARIZATION OF TYRANNIES MUST FAIL (By Allan Nevins, Collier's, October 20, 1951)

Disraeli said, "I have ever been of the opinion that revolutions are not to be evaded."

Quoting the author, "Ours is as revolutionary an era as that which lasted from 1776 to 1821, overturning governments, institutions, and ideas throughout Europe and the two Americas."

"It would be an error to say that the two systems, Soviet dictatorship and western freedom, cannot coexist, for they have in fact coexisted for 33 years. But they cannot coexist indefinitely without radical change in one. We are in much the same position as that which Lincoln recognized when he said in 1858 that 'a house divided against itself could not stand—that the United States could not exist half slave and half free. * * *'"

"We can say today that the world has existed half Communist, half democratic for more than a quarter of a century because each half expected its ideals and methods to conquer the other half. One side or the other must change. And we can echo Lincoln's further statement of 1858: 'A crisis must be reached and passed, giving the world confidence that it will regain a decent unity and harmony.'"

"Either freedom will win, or dictatorship will win."

DIFFERENCES IN RIVAL BELIEFS *

"Between the two rival expectations, however, lies a vital difference. The Kremlin bases its belief in our early downfall upon the theories of Marx and Lenin as footnoted by Stalin. We base our confidence in a coming Russian revolution on plain historical facts and established historical principles."

"Every lesson of history does go to show that * * * such a system as is enthroned in Moscow, with its concentration of military, political, and economic power in a despotic oligarchy, with its police terror, with its suppression of free discussion, and with its fettering of seven or eight satellite states, must in no long time undergo a sharp transformation."

We should take a long-range view of the human situation."

In 1934, Jan Smuts, the Boer general who became Prime Minister of South Africa, in an address on freedom, looking at Hitler,

"The Soviet Union is confident of the breakdown of the non-Communist world. * * *. We of the free nations are equally confident that the tyrannical Communist dictatorship must yield to a better order."

have been made. Yet, today, we do not have either a unified cataloging or purchasing system. We have failed to get even a semblance of economy.

The Hébert subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee of the House, the Bonner subcommittee and the Hardy subcommittee of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; a Senate committee, have all pointed to millions, even billions, of dollars of waste connected with the activities of the armed services.

Billions upon billions of dollars we have given to those services and much of that money has been deliberately wasted. Yet recently we were told by the commander of the Air Force that our planes were inferior in both number and efficiency to those of the enemy.

the day will dawn when the misled people of Russia will realize that it does not pay to hold a ring of subjugated, sullen, unhappy people in bondage. History shows that it never has paid."

"Sir Thomas More wrote in his Utopia, 1516, that France ought to stop trying to dominate Italy and to enslave Flanders. He spoke of the example set by the imaginary nation he called the Achoriens: ' . . . a people that lie on the southeast side of Utopia, who long ago engaged in war in order to add to the dominions of their prince another kingdom, to which he had some pretensions by an ancient alliance. This they conquered, but found the trouble of keeping it was equal to that by which it was gained; that the conquered people were always either in rebellion, or exposed to foreign invasion, while they were obliged to be incessantly at war, either for or against them, and consequently could never disband their army, that in the meantime they were oppressed with taxes, their money went out of the kingdom, their blood was split for the glory of the king, without procuring the least advantage for the people, who received not the smallest advantage from it in time of peace.'"

"The third reason for our confidence in a coming Russian revolution, violent or peaceable, is that no power has ever yet been able to prevent the entry of ideas from other lands. The Soviet dictatorship could not exist without its iron curtain. General knowledge of the superior living conditions of the West, and of the blessings of freedom of movement, freedom of mind and freedom to choose work, would crumble its foundations. Hence the furious zeal of the Politburo to make the iron curtain impenetrable. . . . But history proves that an iron curtain always has chinks and rustholes; that a fabric which looks airtight always yields to the invisible osmosis of information.

"Dictatorships for centuries have used exile, death, prison, censorship, book burnings, control of schools and universities, and the systematic falsehoods of a propaganda machine—and always, in the long run, in vain. No doubt the Politburo has brought indoctrination to a new pitch of perfection. No doubt it has molded the minds of millions from infancy. But then modern science has also brought the power of ideas to ride the radio waves to a new pitch of perfection."

NEW IDEAS CAN'T BE STOPPED

"Philip II and the Spanish Inquisition tried to crush freedom of thought; but they failed. The French Bourbons were implacably hostile to ideas; but the enlightenment came in nonetheless—with revolution in its train. Napoleon III exiled Victor Hugo, chained the French press, and steam-rolled the universities. . . . Hitler burned a mountain of books, exiled thousands of intel-

With the armed services record of waste of our dollars, there is no reason to believe that it would be less wasteful with the lives of our men. Lost dollars, even though they number billions, can be replaced.

But a lost generation cannot be replaced.

Military training in high schools, colleges, universities, ROTC, and the State militia, we must have.

Certainly until the armed services learn to use our dollars with some degree

lectuals from Thomas Mann down, muzzled all editors, and filled the concentration camps with men who dared to think; but he could not stop the movement of ideas in Germany.

"The fact is that intellectual repression defeats itself by creating suspicion and skepticism, the parents of revolt."

MUST ADJUST TO CHANGES

"We have still another reason for believing that a drastic transformation is sooner or later inevitable in Russia. If history demonstrates anything, it is that any country which cannot adjust itself constantly and even radically to internal change—that is, any dictatorship which tries to keep a frozen political and social system—is certain to be overtaken by revolution. No regime has ever lasted unless it had the power of self-criticism and self-reform. That is precisely the power which Stalinism lacks."

A dictatorship always looks highly efficient—for a time—but always proves inefficient. The dictatorship cannot persuade public opinion, and so resorts to force.

"Inefficiency is, in the long run, one of the hallmarks of a dictatorship. It inevitably increases, for the simple reason that a dictatorship has no power of self-correction. In Soviet Russia minor criticisms are encouraged, for they help take men's minds off the major issues. But all fundamental policies are sacrosanct, and anyone who dares call in question a high decision or high official is summarily silenced. It was such a refusal to permit the discussion of fundamental change which played a large part in the downfall of divine-right monarchs like Charles I, of Napoleon III, of the Hohenzollerns, and of the Czarist regime.

"By contrast, the long-term efficiency of the democracies lies to a great extent in their seeming division and dissension on lines of major policy. The bitter debate of 1951 between President Truman and General MacArthur, and the ugly quarrel between Prime Minister Attlee and Aneurin Bevin, appeared hurtful. But in the end the constant publicity given to policy, the free criticism of errors, and the ceaselessly grinding machinery of self-correction are invaluable.

"Stability is the possession of only those nations which allow constant reform and change. Because one great wave of evolution after another has rolled over America—Jeffersonian, Jacksonian, Lincolnian, Wilsonian, Rooseveltian—we have avoided revolution. The same statement can be made of Great Britain, which ceaselessly debates change. Meanwhile, the Politburo sits on the safety valve.

RUSSIA'S GREAT WEAKNESSES

"1. It is ambitious to dominate Europe and the world.

"2. It is trying to enthrall and exploit a chain of vassal nations.

"3. It is attempting to cut Russia off from the flow of world ideas.

"4. It has established the worst repressions in history to punish internal criticism and block peaceable change.

"The pressures in the boiler will mount dangerously. Unless the policies are altered,

of efficiency, I will not vote to give them, for 8 years, absolute control over the lives of the youth of this and succeeding generations.

Let no one be deceived by the argument that this bill is only a measure to train our youth for 6 months.

Those who at the end of the last war signed up to go into the Reserves with the thought that they would not be called again to active service now know that, once the military gets control of the individual it is loath to relinquish its authority over him.

Men taken into this program for 6 months will find that, for an additional seven and a half long years, they are subject to the beck and call of the military.

The doctor, the scientist, may at any time, when the Executive and the military so will, be called to pick up cigarette butts on a parade ground, mop out a barracks.

what Jan Smuts called a 'cataclysm' is certain.

"When a dictatorship looks strongest to the gaze of the world, the props behind the facade are often cracking. Bonaparte appeared his strongest in 1811, but in 1813 he was overwhelmed. When 1848 began, the reactionary order in Europe under Metternich's system seemed solid as granite. Then a revolt began in Palermo. Within a few weeks the Germans in Austria, the Magyars in Hungary, the Poles in Russia, the south Slavs on the Adriatic, and the Czechs in Bohemia all rose. In 1865, Napoleon III thought himself secure; in 1870 the debacle. Hitler and Mussolini bestrode Europe in 1939; but by 1943 doom was overtaking them.

"No nation ever stands still; it must move forward in some direction. . . . But we can say that unless all the lights of history are misleading, the Soviet dictatorship is now on the highroad to revolution and ruin. The vital question is whether it can alter its course with enough speed and thoroughness to avert another of the calamities of history. Several distinct possibilities exist:

1. "If the Politburo pursues its present aggressive policies unchanged, great danger exists that some reckless plunge, some miscalculation of chances, will precipitate the third world war. This would end with revolution inside Russia."

2. "A revolt in one of the satellites may spread to several or all of them and bring about a sharp modification of policy in the Kremlin. The Poles, the Chinese, and the Czechs in particular will not forever draw the Soviet chariot."

3. "If Russia abandons her aggressive foreign policy as too risky, but maintains her repressive, tyrannical system at home, a revolution must ultimately start from within. It might begin as a palace revolution on the death of Stalin or his successor. It might be a massive uprising of the Russian people to make their paper constitution a reality and put effective truth into its empty clauses. The new Russia would doubtless be very different from the western democracies, but it might well be progressive and cooperative."

HOPE FOR CHANGE

"Finally, a faint chance exists that a new leadership will emerge in Moscow, which . . . will gradually relax both the aggressive internal policy and the internal tyranny. The chances are that steps in this direction would be accelerated by revolutionary action.

"But whatever the outcome, a crisis must be reached and passed. And when the day

Fourth. If we adopt universal military training and the necessary sustaining policies, will—

(a) The freedom of the individual be lessened?

(b) Our standard of living be lowered?

(c) Our ability to make secure the future of our Republic be destroyed?

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND THE SUSTAINING POLICIES WHICH WILL FOLLOW WILL LESSEN THE FREEDOM OF THE INDIVIDUAL

Universal military training does not, cannot, stand alone. If we adopt universal military training, to implement it, quarters must be built; equipment must be furnished and, with the present demands to carry on the war in Korea, maintain an armed force in Europe and ships or a fleet fully equipped with carriers and planes on most of the seven seas. Our resources and productivity are already overtaxed.

It will follow, then, that further allocation of material, of manpower, and of dollars, will be necessary for the training of these men.

We will have planning in an ever-increasing degree. We will have more and more regimentation. There will be no limit, no end, to the rules, regulations, and directives promulgated by those in charge of this program. Universal military training and its accompanying policies will, in the end, give us a dictatorship. Dictatorship means tyranny. Tyranny means the end of freedom for the individual.

There is no uncertainty about this program. It matters not at all what we are told by the advocates of this bill.

Some of us know from bitter experience that, while Congress may write a law, the military interprets and administers it.

There is not a Member of this House who does not know that men have been inducted into the service under the explicit agreement that they would be held for a stated limited period of time. That was a contract between the United States Government, between Uncle Sam and the young man who enlisted, relying upon the promise that his service would be for a specified time.

The Constitution provides that no State shall impair the obligation of a contract.

The Constitution provides that no man's property—and time is property—shall be taken from him without ade-

comes that Russia, bowing either to revolution or irresistible forces of evolution, asks for the assistance of the free peoples of the world, we must have but one watchword—generosity."

The author goes on to say that in 1949 Emperor Hirohito, at the opening session of the Japanese Diet, thanked the Allied Powers for their good will and assistance in "the reconstruction of Japan into a democratic state"; and the author then says that such a transformation is by no means impossible in Russia, and that the day may not be too far off when they will join with the friendly peoples of the globe and seek our advice in reconstruction of the Russian republics; that they may then have much to teach us and we have much to teach them; and that we can then "push forward together to throw open the gates to the golden age."

quate compensation. Common honesty and decency require that the Government keep faith with those with whom it deals.

But a dishonest Government, after inducing young men to enlist for a stated number of months, increased that term of service by adding 12 additional months.

Again, in World War II, Congress added the Tydings amendment to the Conscription Act. In brief, that amendment provided that those who were exclusively engaged in necessary agricultural pursuits should not be drafted. General Hershey, who interprets and administers the draft laws, not only misinterpreted that law, but deliberately disregarded it. Federal men were sent to the State of Michigan and they gave the State and local draft officials to understand that the Tydings amendment should be disregarded.

I know what I am talking about. The record is replete with specific instances of that conduct. Moreover, General Hershey told me in my office that, when the armed services needed men, it would take them. That statement was typical of altogether too many high in authority in the armed services.

The armed services, as was pointed out last Wednesday by our colleague from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] not only ignores the constitutional right to free speech and a free press, but punishes as it did Admiral Denfeld, those in the services who, when called before congressional committees to aid in writing legislation, exercise that right, state their honest convictions.

I have a distinct recollection of how, when a House committee was considering the writing of the unification bill, information which would have aided in drafting that legislation was denied us. Some 20 officers and individuals having first-hand information were gagged. That is an illustration of the way military men will, on occasion, impose their will upon the rest of us.

Just a few days ago, General Ridgway, speaking from Korea, condemned those who, here in America, questioned the objectives of the war where he is commander. He seemed to think that the American fathers and mothers who furnish the men to do the fighting under him, the taxpayers whose toil creates the dollars which enable his men to fight, must accept, without question, whatever the military mind chooses to put out.

He apparently—and I have no criticism of him except as he adopts an all-too-prevalent military idea—is convinced that military authorities are not to be questioned even though the issue is one of policy on the home front, the productive front, the civilian front. No one questions his decisions on military matters, but whether we shall fight in Korea or anywhere else is not for his decision.

Fourth. If we adopt UMT and the necessary sustaining policies, will (b) our standard of living be lowered?

Universal military training is something new, something added. It calls for the collection of additional sums from the taxpayers. Apparently, no one knows the cost. One thing we do

know, and that is that it will each year take several hundred thousand young men, from productive civilian pursuits, make them nonproducers, and require, for their maintenance and training, millions, if not billions, of dollars.

Even the most visionary must realize that, with the public debt approaching \$300,000,000,000 carrying an interest charge of something over \$6,000,000,000 per year, with the obligation of maintaining an army in Europe, carrying on a war in Korea, distributing billions to other countries, our ability to continue our present standard of living cannot be continued; that each and every one of us will be forced to work longer hours and do with less. In brief, we will be forced to an austerity program similar to that under which the people of England are now suffering—now described as one of slow starvation.

Many have been surprised that our people did not long ago rebel because of the needless burdens which this and the preceding administrations have put upon them. One reason may be that they are essentially law abiding. It is also possible that they have not yet realized the falsity of the apparent prosperity which they think they have been enjoying. Some do not yet understand that the increase in the pay check is more than offset by the loss of the purchasing power of that check.

Few will deny that there is a limit to our ability to produce and spend. All, if they think, will reach the conclusion that only by longer hours of harder work, and living on less, can any further demands upon us be met.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING, IF ADOPTED, WILL LOWER OUR STANDARD OF LIVING

Fourth. If we adopt UMT and the necessary sustaining policies will (c) our ability to make secure the future of our Republic be destroyed?

In my judgment, it will, because we will destroy our ability to produce and, through the depletion of our manpower by our participation in foreign wars, render ourselves incapable of defense.

We are told that we must have universal military training in order to meet Stalin's threat to destroy the Republic.

Even the proponents of this plan will admit that Stalin has no navy to transport an army to our shores and here maintain it.

They will admit that his productive capacity is not as great as ours.

But they say, by taking possession of Europe, bringing the resources of Asia under his control, he will become powerful enough to destroy us.

This claim rests upon the assumption that he can unite the peoples of Western Europe and of Asia, and, with his own people, weld them into one united, overwhelming force.

History, however, discloses that no man, no nation, has ever been able to accomplish that purpose.

Stalin's conception of conquering the world—if he has such a conception, and, to date, so far as we know, not a single Russian soldier has lost his life fighting in any of the current theaters of war—is no more likely to succeed than have

the efforts of other would-be world conquerors. Stalin, like Genghis Khan, Alexander the Great, Napoleon, Charles of Sweden, the Kaiser, Hitler, may attempt to conquer the world, but will meet a similar fate.

Nor has any would-be world conqueror ever been able to conquer and bend to his will the Chinese Nation.

For centuries, efforts have been made to unite under one ruler the nations of central Europe. Every such attempt failed. In my humble judgment, whatever may be Stalin's purpose, he will never succeed, either by force of arms or by propaganda, in uniting the nations of eastern Europe or of the East in an effort to make war upon the Western Hemisphere.

If, however, we fall into Stalin's trap of fighting on every front wherever in the world there may be war instigated by him, then, surely, we will wreck ourselves.

The danger which threatens us today is, as Lincoln and so many have said, not from without, not from foreign foes, but from within—from those who have no faith either in our form of government or our people. Our danger comes from the Achesons, the Rosenbergs. Our present danger comes from those who seem to think and who act as though it is our duty to, by force of arms, compel all other peoples, all other nations, to discard their way of life, accept and submit to plans which some of our misguided do-gooders and some who have forgotten their allegiance to this country think they can impose upon, which would be better for, other peoples, other nations.

To me comes the thought that we may commit national suicide by the indiscriminate giving or using of our dollars, our resources, our manpower, for the benefit of other nations whose people apparently are not willing to submit to the things we would impose upon them.

UMT AS A CHARACTER BUILDER

Proponents of this bill contend that UMT will prove to be a great "good character" builder for our young men.

That argument is an indictment of the teachings and the practices advocated in every right-thinking family every church of every denomination, every religious group, and every educational institution.

Boiled down, it means that the Army is better qualified to and will better teach the youth of this land honesty, decency, respect for law and God, than will parents, schools, churches.

It would be absurd to charge the Armed Forces as a whole with any less degree of admirable characteristics than any other group.

In the old days, every army had its group of women camp followers. Every army had its group which disregarded the rights of the civilian population; sought, at times, to live off the country.

Who has forgotten the situation during the last World War when public sentiment finally forced the Navy in Japan to break up the houses of prostitution, outside of which long lines of men were waiting?

Oh, I know it is an unpleasant subject. But the young men of this country and the parents of those men, as well as future generations, demand that we should have before us, in considering a measure of this kind, some of the well-known facts of life.

Men engaged in war are, by nature and of necessity, brutal. Killing the enemy is no pastime; it is a business. Killing men is bound to harden the killer. Realizing that the coming dawn may bring death, there is always the temptation on the part of some of less religious faith to let down—do things which otherwise would be abhorrent.

That human nature, war and the destructive influence of war have not greatly changed; that good character-building by the military is no adequate substitute for home, school and church, permit me to read an editorial which appeared in the Times-Herald of Washington earlier this week:

THE ARMY AS MORAL PRECEPTOR

We refer two recent reports from Germany and Japan to those proponents of universal military training who say that this would be a great contribution to building the character of American youth:

1. The State department legal office in Munich reported that American soldiers had assumed legal responsibility for 5,000 infants born out of wedlock in occupied Germany. The average of such acknowledged cases is running at 30 a week.

2. The newspaper Yomiuri of Tokyo, Japan's largest, demands that the United States make provision for 200,000 half-Japanese waifs fathered by American occupation troops. An American public health officer terms the figure an exaggeration, but does not dispute that there are a large number of such illegitimates. Yomiuri suggests that the United States bring these orphans here.

We now turn to a recent report of the National Security committee of New York, the chairman of which is former Justice Owen J. Roberts of the Supreme Court, relating to the supposed beneficial effects of UMT. This is characterized as an "educational program," in which the chaplain corps will have a prominent role in inculcating religious and character traits. The report states that the "character guidance" part of the UMT program consists of "sex-education responsibility, marriage and family life, religion, moral principles, and citizenship."

The UMT program, according to this propaganda, will seek to maintain "fine atmosphere, attitudes, and spirit." The character training will be "transferable to civilian life."

The laboratory reports from Germany and Japan show the system in full flower. The conscripts must have slept through the army's classes in character building.

Unpleasant as is this subject, one has but to consult the press as to what happened right here in Washington in World War II—and no doubt Washington was no worse than other cities. The press of that day carried stories of groups of teen-aged girls who seemed to think it their patriotic duty to consort with servicemen going overseas, because, it was said, they might never return.

This legislation, if adopted, may utterly destroy the desire of our people to remain true to the teachings of our religion, the principles and practices of our forefathers, which have made us strong,

charitable, and with at least some respect for decency and honesty.

God save the nation which follows a policy of taking into its innermost councils and permitting the creation and direction of its policies by those who either come from or adhere to the political philosophy which, in other lands, has destroyed freedom, initiative, and the opportunity for either material or spiritual advancement.

I do not criticize Anna Rosenberg, or anyone else who comes to this country to better his condition, or upon arrival, infiltrates into well-paying, policy-making, powerful positions in the Federal Government.

I do criticize them when they attempt to change our system of government. If they do not like, are not satisfied with, our way of life, why do they not stay in their own countries and work out their reforms there?

And I do criticize those of our own citizens who are so intent upon their own businesses, so absorbed in the pursuit of the almighty dollar, in taking their own ease, that they refuse to sacrifice any part of their time, devote their ability to the business of this Government.

It is their neglect of, their indifference to, their duty to participate in the affairs of their Government, which has opened the door to resourceful individuals with ability, but with un-American ideas, to take over, advocate policies which would destroy us.

Earlier in the debate, the Congressman from Mississippi, Mr. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, put into the RECORD—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 26, pages 1445-1446—a letter written to Mrs. Anna Rosenberg and her reply.

Our colleague's third question was:

Is it contemplated that a trainee may have a free choice of serving with an all white, all Negro, or mixed unit?

Mrs. Rosenberg's answer—and remember she is Assistant Secretary of Defense and one of the advocates of this plan—was a clear, frank "No."

Lowell Mellett, a left-wing, New Deal columnist and an efficient chronic mudslinger, commenting said:

So there it is, the same old ugly issue. Probably others than Senator TAFT would like to see it deferred another 3 years.

Mr. Mellett and other of like ilk, as well as professional agitators who make a profit out of stirring up trouble, may consider the issue an "ugly" one; they may attempt to use it in their vilifying campaign to defeat Senator TAFT, but it is an issue which must some day be solved on its merits, rather than one to be used by conscienceless instigators of class feeling.

I believe in equality of opportunity, regardless of race, color, creed, sex, or state of origin.

To that end I introduced an FEPC bill, to be interpreted by and administered under our judicial system—not by a board or commission appointed to garner votes in some political campaign.

But individuals like Anna Rosenberg, Mellett and some financially minded

professional proponents who use segregation as a political issue, are not satisfied with, do not believe in equality of opportunity for all citizens.

If they would be satisfied with, if they did believe in equality of opportunity, they would not deny to the members of any race, any creed, or any nationality the opportunity—when it would not interfere with the welfare of the Nation—to select their own associates and as, in this instance, serve as they might choose with either an all white, all colored, or mixed unit.

I wish that sometime someone would clearly define, for those of us who are trying to solve the social problems which confront us, the clear line of demarcation between preference and discrimination. To make clear my meaning, when one marries, he or she exercises a preference, and, of necessity, discriminates against every other individual who might desire marriage with the one exercising the preference.

Another question—if there is to be no segregation under UMT because of race, creed, color, or country of origin, are we to segregate because of sex? Or, shortly, will we have the demand that, in the near future, the Waves, the Wacs, the Spars, and the women trainees be thrown into the same training unit with the young men?

In view of the letter from the grandmother, from which I quoted, this query is not absurd.

The grandmother wrote, in effect, that she thought UMT would be good for her two granddaughters. I doubt that she accurately expressed her real thought which, I assume, was that no one should be sent to war untrained and that some kind of discipline would be good, even for her own—again I entertain an assumption—lovely, well-behaved granddaughters.

Russia, Germany, Italy, France, and, no doubt other nations have tried compulsory universal military training.

In every country which has adopted it except two, it has neither brought peace nor victory. In every instance it has either brought or been followed by war, military defeat and economic bankruptcy.

True, Sweden and Switzerland have both had compulsory universal military training and both have remained at peace.

But either is a country which its more powerful neighbors might have, if they so desired, overrun and conquered. But both have followed a policy of avoiding entanglements in the affairs of their neighbors.

Both, by so doing, have been able to remain at peace, to produce and to sell food and munitions of war to neighbors who, notwithstanding their policies of compulsory universal military training, preferred and engaged in war.

We do not need, we will never need, universal military training, with its inevitable regimentation, dictatorship and tyranny, if we will discard our present foreign policy, oust those who follow the Acheson school of thought, adopt a policy similar to that advocated by Churchill for the British Empire.

Our policy should be one similar to that which is followed by the statesmen of every other nation. It should be a policy which will best serve the interest of our own country.

Self-preservation shapes the conduct of all other nations. It must, if the Republic is to continue, determine our policy. And that policy must be interpreted and administered by individuals who have faith in the principles of the Constitution, confidence in the ability, the courage, the determination of our people. It must be interpreted and administered by men whose sole purpose is the welfare, the security of our people and our country.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY].

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, the subject matter which we are debating this week is the most important of the domestic questions which we may be called upon to consider during this term of Congress. This very debate could well be characterized as the "great debate." We are here considering a proposal which, if it becomes laws, will penetrate every cell of the social structure of the United States, which will affect directly or indirectly every family in the Nation. This is a decision which should cause us to hesitate and to consider carefully. Yet it is a decision which we must face. It will not benefit us or the Nation to turn away from the reality of the evil which faces us, to underestimate its power or fail to make adequate preparations to meet and overcome this evil. This is no time to deceive ourselves with the false optimism of the nineteenth century or that of the twenties of our own century. We must not forget the bitter lesson we have learned in this generation, that evil itself is a progressive force, and that through mass education and mass production, the modern world provides almost unlimited possibilities for its growth.

The question before us is not the pleasant one of proposing means and methods by which the horizons of freedom may be further extended. The question is not one of securing greater freedom for a people already possessing a large measure of freedom but rather one of securing the freedom which we still possess and of giving some assurance to other people, who still value freedom and who still seek it, that their cause is our cause.

It has been argued in the course of this debate that this is not the time to make this decision. I believe that this is a good time to make the basic decision to establish a program of military training which will supplement and complement the program now being carried out under the volunteer and selective service systems. I say it is a good time because we are now in a state between all-out war and an uncertain and precarious

peace. At this time it is important that we recall the truth expressed by the historian, W. H. Gardiner, speaking for all people to whom political authority and political responsibility is entrusted:

We are but the transient trustees of the heritages of all for which the past has lived, charged with administering it for a little while, but surcharged with responsibility of administering today our trust for the future, of our successors and of the world, in such manner that they will not look back upon us as false trustees, who took our present ease instead of performing our perhaps more painful duty as a sound link in the chain of generations.

It would not be becoming to us to avoid this responsibility, to make the easy decision in our own day and to leave the hard and the difficult to the future.

It is an unpleasant fact that persons in authority must always make decisions for a specific situation, the first responsibility of anyone in authority is to make his decision in conformity with conscience. This involves two considerations:

First. Consideration of the rightness or wrongness of the purpose of the action.

Second. Consideration of the justice or injustice and of the appropriateness of the means proposed.

No one to my knowledge, in this debate, has yet declared that a more comprehensive military training program would, in itself, be immoral. There have been general charges that military training in itself is necessarily debasing and demoralizing. This is a charge which cannot be readily supported. The testimony of the former members of the armed services who have spoken here on the floor of the House is in direct contradiction, as is also the fact that the veterans of both World War I and World War II have assumed full responsibility as citizens. I am sure that there is no Member of the House of Representatives who would assert or undertake to prove that the moral integrity of the veterans of these wars is of a lower order than that of other men who did not serve. It is strangely contradictory to find the Members of the Congress of the United States, a Nation which counts among its greatest and honored citizens its military heroes, denouncing military life as necessarily destructive of good character. I do not endorse the argument made by some of the proponents of this measure that military training necessarily perfects the character of those who are subjected to such training. The problem of human personality is much too complex and much too profound to be solved by either of these two simple proposals.

It is to be regretted that simply because we look upon war and military service as unpleasant that we have in a sense, quarantined and set it apart from our view of life. The charge was made on the floor of the House yesterday that military service was a manifestation of materialism. If this is true, then any human activity which has to do with the temporal improvement of man could be labeled materialistic. Actually what has happened is that the service of the soldier has been secularized. It

is a strange thing that we today call upon men to fight for Christianity, yet we deny that there can be a Christian soldier. We assert that Christianity makes good soldiers but deny that in fulfilling the responsibility of a soldier a man may even retain his Christian character, much less improve it.

The general assertion has been made that this proposal is contrary to the American tradition. Actually this is to use very carelessly and loosely the term, "tradition." There is no fixed pattern in the United States with regard to military service, but rather our program has been one of adjustment to the needs and demands of the situations.

At the time of the Revolution we adopted a system which was new in the history of the then modern world. Ours was the first modern attempt at a citizen's army. Our army was drawn directly from the people and it was assumed that all who were able-bodied and who could be spared, had a responsibility to serve. Since that time we have used a multitude of devices, ranging from the volunteer program, and the use of State militia, down to and including the draft and conscription of World War I and World War II, together with the recall of Reserves. The question today is not one of adherence to tradition, but rather one of making decisions based on the needs of the day.

Justice and the demands of the common good argue for the adoption of the program to supplement and complement the present selective-service program. I am sure there is no Member of this body who would openly attempt to justify the grave injustices which were suffered by the members of the various Reserve components who were called back into service as the result of the Korean conflict.

It is not my intention to discuss in any further detail the provisions and effects of this bill. It is my opinion that the committee members and others who have spoken in favor of the bill have established in a satisfactory manner that this legislation will provide a means of maintaining an adequate military establishment; that it will provide this at a smaller cost to the American people and with less serious interruption of the normal peacetime economy and private lives of our citizens.

There are certain technical details in the bill which I do believe should be more carefully drawn. I am hopeful that those perfecting and technical amendments which I understand will be offered will be accepted and that the membership of the House will then give support to this legislation, which, if not immediately necessary, will certainly become necessary if the course of history continues in the direction now indicated.

I do not advocate this program as a permanent institution in the United States, but rather as a temporary and transitional one which, in my opinion, will help us as a nation to meet more effectively the demands which history has imposed upon us, and which will help to establish more quickly and effectively the day of peace among nations.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI].

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, is it better to be a living pauper or a dead rich man? Is solvency or survival the issue?

In 1914 all the gold in the treasuries of England, Germany, and Austria did not prevent World War I.

Nor did flashing tomahawks spare the scalps of those who came to America to avoid conscription. Have not the bullets of Europe and Asia, and of those between the States, pierced and shattered with equal fury the bones of their offspring?

History, Mr. Chairman. Count our wars: 1776, 1812, 1846, 1864, 1898, 1914, 1941, 1950. Eight, or an average of one every 22 years.

The bill before this House says to our boys, in effect, "Son, to give you the life you cherish and the land you love, your countrymen have laid down their lives every 25 years. At 18 we want you to be ready to do the same but live to tell the story."

Communist aggressors rock the boat. In 1964, some say, other tyrants will, too.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand a copy of Public Law 51, Eighty-second Congress, the title of which reads:

An act to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes.

Public Law No. 51 became a law during the first session of this Congress. The House on April 13, 1951, approved the bill by a vote of 372 to 44; while the Senate on March 9, 1951, did likewise by a vote of 79 to 5. Therefore, it is possible to say that this Congress, by an overwhelming majority approved the principle of universal military training.

While I am not denying any Member of this body the right to his opinion, in my estimation, when I voted for Public Law 51, I committed myself to the principle of universal military training with the understanding that the National Security Training Commission provided for in Public Law 51 would recommend to Congress a training program together with a set of general rules and regulations setting forth legal rights, disciplinary measures, welfare safeguards, and disability and death benefits for the UMT trainees.

In short, the bill that we have before us, H. R. 5904, is nothing more than a companion bill to the basic legislation passed by this Congress last year providing that before a UMT program could begin—under which youths of 18½ would be given 6 months of basic military training, and then be assigned to the Reserves for 7½ years—legislation would be required to establish a code of conduct for the trainees and to set forth their rights, benefits, and privileges.

When I voted for Public Law 51, last April, I joined 371 of my colleagues who

felt as I did, that as a nation, we are confronted with a world situation of such gravity and such unpredictability that we must be prepared for effective action, whether the challenge comes with the speed of sound or is delayed for a lifetime.

If there are any skeptics who treat the international situation lightly, I am sure if they study events in Korea and elsewhere in the world, they will agree that there is no doubt that the Kremlin is determined to communize and dominate the globe, either by direct or indirect aggression, unless the threat of world communism is extinguished.

In my consideration of the necessity of Public Law 51 last year, my study was based principally on my knowledge and experience as a veteran of two world wars, supplemented by my active membership for several years on the House Committee on the Armed Services and on the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy.

I assure you that politics and my personal feelings were laid aside in considering this vital issue and that one factor alone dominated my thinking: A burning desire to be of service to my country and the American people by providing this Nation with an adequate national defense that would include a strong Reserve program.

Since last year, I am sure that no one present will deny the fact that world conditions have not improved. For 8 months we have been talking of a truce in Korea while Red China has wrested control of the air from us in that area.

As the days go by, we hear constant rumblings from other trouble spots in the world that could challenge the future security of our Nation.

In my opinion there is a greater need today for Public Law 51 than there was a year ago. I base my opinion on the fact that our very existence as a nation is at stake and that this crisis will not only be with us for months but may threaten us for many years if we can rely on Defense Secretary Lovett's statement that—

This crisis may be with us for 10 or more years.

At the same time Charles E. Wilson, Director of Defense Mobilization, said:

The mobilization plans of this country have been revised to provide for a crisis that may last 50 or 60 years.

Taking Mr. Lovett and Mr. Wilson at their word—and if we cannot take the word of these two prominent Americans, I say in all sincerity, whose word can we take—the Communist threat will be with us for a long time, thus requiring us to keep our guard up, which means maintaining a large standing army at a terrific cost.

At this point I would like to quote United States Senator RICHARD RUSSELL of Georgia, when he said:

I am an ardent advocate of universal military training because it will enable us to utilize a reserve system rather than maintain a large standing force. The issue is no

longer whether it is desirable to have UMT—it is whether we can exist and stay out of national bankruptcy—without such a system.

Senator RUSSELL continued by saying:

Because there has been no UMT the task of defending the country is not being equally shared. Under our present Reserve system, he points out, at least 85 percent of the trained men in our Armed Forces today are those who served in World War II, so that when trained men are sought, it is necessary to draw on those who have already fought in one or more wars.

In a few words, Senator RUSSELL hit the nail on the head by using two of the most convincing arguments in behalf of UMT. The first and most obvious one has to do with the cost of security, and the second concerns fair play or more equal sharing of the task of defending the Nation.

I believe that every Member of Congress is familiar with my interest in formulating a Reserve program designed to not only give our country a reservoir of trained manpower in the event of a national emergency, but to reduce the staggering cost of maintaining an adequate national defense.

In this connection I want to point to Public Law 810, Eightieth Congress, a retirement act for the Reserves, and Public Law 783, Eighty-first Congress, providing for the utilization of joint training facilities such as armories, National Guard camps, and so forth. In addition, I call to your attention the Reserve bill that the House passed last year and which is now pending in the Senate that provides a complete program for Reserve personnel.

Then, too, the House Committee on Armed Services is scheduled to examine the over-all ROTC program and also consider bills that will provide promotion and an equalization of rights and benefits to the Reserves of the Nation. But most important of all is the fact that when this Congress passed Public Law 51 last year, establishing UMT, it was then recognized as being part of the new Reserve program and the bill that is now before us is necessary to put Public Law 51 in effect and to round out the over-all Reserve program.

Briefly, here is the new Reserve program that many of us have been working on for the past several years. First, Selective Service will act as a procurement agency of manpower, channeling annually into the Universal Military Training Corps 800,000 young men at the age of 18½ years and who, after 6 months of basic military training, will be further channeled into the various Reserve units located in the vicinity of their homes, where they will serve 7½ years. As a member of the Ready Reserves, they will participate in weekly drills and take 2 weeks of summer training for a period of 3 years, at the conclusion of which they will become members of the Stand-by Reserve, where they will only be required to take 15 days of summer training contingent on appropriations being made for that purpose. Weekly drills, however, will be optional. The necessary commissioned officers to supervise this over-all Reserve program will come from the pool of offi-

cers we have today, as well as from the graduates of ROTC and officer candidate schools in the future.

In other words, without UMT this over-all Reserve program will be lifeless because the manpower will not be available to make up the vast reservoir of trained reserves necessary to augment our Regular forces in times of national emergency. May I add, that these reserves cannot be called to active duty for periods of 30 days or more unless the Congress of the United States authorizes the President to do so.

From the standpoint of the cost of national defense—and I think my figures are just as good as anybody else's—to maintain either an officer or an enlisted man in active duty, including uniforms, training, pay, food, equipment and so forth—it costs the American taxpayers about \$11,000 annually. On the other hand, to maintain a reserve, it will cost for 1 year, an average expenditure of \$434.

Therefore, with a strong Reserve force available, when world conditions permit, the personnel strength of the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps can be reduced to the lowest possible number and thus reduce at the same time, the tremendous cost of maintaining an adequate national defense.

No doubt the thought arises as to the cost of the annual training for 800,000 UMT trainees. According to the best estimates available, the annual cost of the program will be two and one-half billion dollars. Even with this additional cost of the UMT program, you are going to drastically reduce the over-all cost of maintaining an adequate national defense by billions of dollars while at the same time having the assurance of a reservoir of trained reserves ready to meet any national emergency.

Getting away from the cost factor for the moment, one of the compelling reasons that caused me to support the principle of UMT was the shabby treatment accorded thousands upon thousands of reservists and members of the National Guard who served in World War II. Thousands of them are now suffering a second major disruption in their lives and careers, because of our short-sighted policy in not preparing younger men to answer the call to the defense of their country. The inequities and hardships resulting from the hit and miss policies of the Department of Defense is a disgrace, and I doubt whether any one of you will challenge that statement.

As Senator RUSSELL said, nearly 85 percent of the trained men in our armed services today are veterans of World War I and World War II, who were recalled to active duty and torn away from their loved ones and their jobs in civilian life.

Unless we provide a balanced UMT and a strong Reserve program, these same reserves who have already fought in two wars will, with their comrades in the Korean War, be called upon to defend this Nation again in the event of another national emergency.

Therefore, I ask you in all sincerity, is not the defense of this Nation to be shared equally by every mother's son—and not shouldered almost entirely by

those who have defended our flag in previous wars?

For a few moments, let us talk about these reserves, the great majority of whom are veterans of World War I and World War II, and who are now on active duty, having been recalled as reservists.

Those who know of my interest in fair play for the reserves, have flooded me with letters in support of universal military training as a means of distributing the responsibility of fighting America's wars on the shoulders of all and not on just a few.

Before reading excerpts from these letters from reservists, I want to assure you that they are not propaganda letters, but come from the hearts of young men who are now fighting their second and third wars.

First. From an Army Reserve captain, now on active duty, I quote the following:

The general opinion among the Reserves is that the UMT bill would lessen the chances of being recalled again in the event of mobilization. Most of them are married, have families, and feel that they have done their part, and should be given a chance to build up their home life without interruption.

I personally think a little military training for all young men would greatly benefit not only the individual but also our country. I cannot agree with those people who feel that Army life would hurt the morals of our young men. On the contrary it would strengthen the morals, build up character and confidence, and make better citizens. Certainly a young man in college away from home and living in dormitories and boarding houses has a greater opportunity to go wild than those in the Army.

Second. From a Reserve first sergeant on active duty, I quote the following observation:

Universal military training will give this country the strength and power it has to maintain and to protect what so many lives were lost for during World War I and II. In time of a national emergency, 10 to 12 months time are wasted in preparing personnel for combat duty. This is lost time. UMT would reduce this to a period of 1 to 3 months and give us completely trained men at all times. Many a sacrifice was made during our last two wars and many unnecessary lives were lost. Let's don't be caught napping again.

Third. From another Reserve sergeant on active duty, I quote the following:

Being inducted into the Army at an age of 18 during World War II, I am a firm believer that 6 months of military training will greatly benefit our young men by strengthening their moral standards and ability to get along with people in the world.

Fourth. Here is another quotation from a letter written by a Reserve sergeant recalled to active duty:

UMT gives a young man at the age of high-school graduation a chance to be on his own and teach him how to handle money. It gives him the opportunity to adjust himself socially to other people. It gives him the added advantage of training at a pace that would not be possible in the event of war.

Furthermore, I would favor UMT for my own son because under proper guidance there will not be open trails to drunkenness and vice.

Fifth. The following quotation is from the letter of another reservist recalled to active duty:

The reasons why I favor UMT are because I am a veteran of World War II with a total of 39½ months' duty. I was recalled to active military service involuntarily and have served 18 months to this present date. I believe UMT will favor my early release because I have done my share and feel these boys with no service owe their country and us veterans a debt. Also, it will build a strong Reserve which we need in the world situation today. The boys who are affected by the UMT will pull a shorter tour of duty than if drafted.

Sixth. Another reservist recalled to active duty says:

I think that the UMT is a good thing. It will do the young men a lot of good, and, at the same time, they will be prepared to fight, if another war comes.

Seventh. The following observation is made by a reservist recalled to active duty after having served 39 months in World War II:

The UMT in my opinion would be the best thing that ever happened to this country due to the condition of the world, which, in detail, means that the United States must maintain a standing army and also have a considerable amount of trained men in reserve.

Eighth. Here are the views of a reservist with a long service record in World War II and now recalled to active duty:

I favor UMT because men could be prepared for foreign duty much faster if they had these 6 months prior basic training.

As long as people live on this earth there will be wars—so there has to be a means of keeping men trained to protect our country.

Ninth. Here are several reasons advanced by another reservist for approval of the UMT training program:

A. I have been a veteran of World War II, and have served 18 months in the present crisis, which in the UMT bill will relieve me of my duties. I am married and have two children.

B. It is good training and educating for the young man.

C. It will help the young man stand on his own two feet, and face the world in reality.

D. In the Army, religion is stressed and good clean living is urged.

E. It will help relieve juvenile delinquency among the younger generation.

F. It will make a good sturdy citizen of our young man.

G. It will help keep our young man from rowdiness and poolrooms.

Tenth. A master sergeant reservist, now recalled, has the following to say in support of UMT:

I favor UMT because I know that due to present world conditions we must maintain an Armed Force to meet any aggression. The cost of maintaining such a large standing Army would wreck the economy of the country, so a Ready Reserve is necessary. As fighting wars is everybody's business, I think that universal training is the only answer, that every young man receive the training that may save his life at some future time. From personal observation in World War II I saw such training pay off. I mean that those individuals who were lucky enough to receive long training survived. Those units who had people with very little training were soon wiped out in combat.

The main points that have been raised against UMT are by church groups protesting that vices are easily picked up by young soldiers. I agree that this is not desirable, but have found that only a very small minority of the draftees now in service drink or go to houses of prostitution.

However, I agree that all UM trainees be protected and guided away from such vices. I think that this will be done. From the military standpoint, it is only good sense, so I think that the church-group objections are unfounded.

One other point has been made against UMT—that is the one about militarism. In this country I feel that that can never happen. The citizens of this country have always fought the wars and have always had a foreign feeling for the military-caste system, have not liked it, and would have no desire to become part of it. They'd want to do the job and get out.

As far as the cost is concerned, it would be a hundred times less to maintain UMT than to maintain a standing army the same size, and either one or the other is a necessity.

Eleventh. A corporal in the Reserves now on active duty expresses his views as follows:

I favor UMT because first, I feel that a young man after leaving high school, once he enters the Armed Forces, learns the duty of a soldier and how to defend himself and his country. It also puts him in contact with other people so that he learns how to get along with other people. It puts him on his own, especially when away from home, and this way he depends more on himself and is able to do his own work or any extra duties that he is not trained for. By being on his own he is able to use his own reasoning and initiative.

In my case, I am 24 years old, married, no children, high-school graduate, and have found that I have improved mentally and physically since I have been in the service.

I heartily favor UMT because my experience has been something I would not exchange. I feel that such training as I have received would do all young men a lot of good and that UMT is necessary for the future security of this Nation.

In addition to the excerpts read to you from reservists' letters, let me quote from a letter I received from a teacher of the senior class in a high school in my congressional district. Keep in mind that if the UMT training program is put into operation, the young men of this class will be among the first trainees:

From a survey taken of the senior class, after a discussion of UMT, we find that about 60 percent are for universal military training and 40 percent against it.

Here is an interesting quotation from the letter I received from the parents of three teen-age boys:

My wife and I talked the military situation over a few weeks ago and we are in favor of universal military training—George, Jr., is in the advanced ROTC at State college; Wilbur will be 18 this April, and Bob will be 16 next month. As parents of three boys who no doubt will all see service, we feel the UMT program is the best.

It is only fair to say at this point that I have received a lot of mail in opposition to UMT and I have read every single communication, and appreciate and respect the viewpoints expressed. On the other hand, I have received more letters from constituents who favor UMT. Up until the time I left my office today, I have the signatures of 1,131 persons in

support of UMT, with 321 persons recorded as opposed to it.

For an illustration, from the city of Altoona, Pa., 427 persons favor UMT and 8 have expressed opposition to it. From State College, Pa., 124 are for UMT with 9 against it. Eighty-six residents of Williamsburg, Pa., oppose UMT and there are no letters in favor of it. Roaring Springs, Pa., has a total of 145 in favor of UMT with 50 opposed to it. The same ratio for and against UMT applies generally to other communities in my congressional district.

I realize that in legislating, you should look with caution on organized campaigns that produce a flood of telegrams, letters, post cards, and petitions, all in identical language.

As I have said with respect to UMT, I have read every communication received on the subject and I appreciate the views of my constituents. But representing some 300,000 residents of the Twenty-second District of Pennsylvania, I have the responsibility of making decisions on legislative matters and must for the greater part, base such decisions on information I have at my fingertips regarding world conditions.

When I voted last year for Public Law 51, authorizing universal military training, I adhered strictly to this policy and I intend to do so with reference to H. R. 5904, the bill we are now considering.

At this time, I would like to comment on the position many opponents of UMT are taking, when they say it is un-Christianlike and will destroy the morals of the youth of America. As a Christian and as a veteran of two world wars, I refuse to subscribe to such sentiments.

To a great extent, we owe our liberty and freedom that we boast of today to the sacrifices of over 19,000,000 American youths who fought America's two global wars. Many of them are back in uniform today, while a great number of them gave their lives in defense of our American ideals. The remainder of these 19,000,000 veterans who are still living, are respected citizens and as you know, reside in every hamlet, town, and city in this great Nation. To infer that the morals of these patriots have been debased by their military service, is an indictment against a segment of our population whose defense of this Nation has earned them gratitude and not slurs on their character.

Then too, the charge that UMT will create a militaristic state is ridiculous and the height of folly. We had over 15,000,000 men and women in uniform during World War II and we heard no cry of their patriotic service as being likely to lead us into a police state.

Despite the arguments advanced for and against UMT, the real issue in my opinion, is whether UMT as a peacetime measure, will preserve and defend the United States of America and distribute the responsibility of service to country in an equal manner and not saddle it on those who have previously been in uniform in one or two global wars or in Korea.

Last year when the House considered what is now Public Law 51, a bill authorizing universal military training,

many of you Members came to me and asked whether or not UMT was a peacetime program, and if it should become a law when would it be inaugurated. My reply to you gentlemen was that UMT as now provided for in Public Law 51 was definitely a peacetime program and that either the President or Congress could "pull the trigger" to inaugurate the program, but only after selective service had been terminated. That was my understanding and I am convinced that when 372 of us approved the legislation in the House, that was the general understanding that prevailed.

When H. R. 5904, the bill which is now before us and which provides the type of training program and establishes a code of conduct for the trainees and sets forth their rights, benefits, and privileges, was initially explained to the House Committee on the Armed Services in executive session, I challenged the provisions that were designed to permit the immediate inauguration of this UMT program while selective service was still in effect.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Armed Services and the members of that committee will recall that I said: "In my opinion the provisions of this bill, H. R. 5904, that will permit UMT to be put in operation alongside of selective service, by calling up 65,000 young men, will not only confuse Members of Congress, but in reality will sabotage the entire UMT program." Today it is apparent that my prophecy is likely to come true, because, in my opinion, the majority of the House will not vote for a UMT program while the draft is in progress.

As I have said before, my interest in UMT is not only from the standpoint of reducing the cost of maintaining an adequate national defense, but to make certain that in fighting future wars, the veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean war will not be called upon again to don their uniforms. In addition, when the draft is stopped, I want a peacetime UMT program that will distribute equally and without favor the responsibility of every young man to defend his country.

When this bill is being read on the floor of the House next week, I will offer several amendments, but principally the following one, designed to make UMT a definite peacetime program. My proposed amendment reads as follows:

Notwithstanding any provisions of law, no person shall be inducted into the corps until such time as all inductions for service in the Armed Forces shall have ceased.

If the majority of the Members of the House will support my amendment, it simply means that when the draft of manpower ends, a peacetime UMT program will be inaugurated, and the young men of the Nation, when reaching the age of 18½ years will be given 6 months of basic military training, after which they will be channeled into a Reserve unit nearest their homes, thus providing a huge reservoir of trained manpower, the only insurance policy this Nation has against world aggression.

In conclusion, I want to state again that my sole interest in Public Law 51 and in this bill, H. R. 5904, is in the over-

all Reserve program that many of us have been working on for the past several years. Despite my vote in favor of Public Law 51 last year, which authorized universal military training, my position on this bill, H. R. 5904, will be determined only when this bill has been finally perfected and if the bill contains a provision making it a peacetime UMT program which was the conception many of us had of the legislation when the basic law authorizing universal military training was passed last year.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER].

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, my eloquent colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], with whom I have served on the Armed Services Committee for a number of years, and other speakers have referred to the pending bill as a measure for peacetime conscription. If I could believe that there is a reasonable probability of a return to normal peacetimes in this unhappy world within the foreseeable future, I would join them now in opposition to this measure, as I have done in the past when similar measures were under consideration.

But Mr. Chairman, after a lifetime of opposition to any form of compulsory military service in America in peacetime, I have reluctantly reached the conclusion that so long as the present menacing condition of world affairs continues the safety of our Nation requires a stable military reserve force of sufficient strength to discourage any enemy attack. A review of our fluctuating national defense policies during the past half century has convinced me that the only practical program for achieving this sustained reserve military strength is the establishment of a system of training for all of the young men of America.

Since the beginning of the present century our national defense policies have been devoid of any semblance of stability. They have vacillated between extremes of strength and weakness so frequently that cynics have compared our military program to a political roller coaster which jittered from peaks of mobilization in periods of national crisis to dangerous depths of unpreparedness in times of fancied calm.

Shortly before the outbreak of World War I in June 1916 we had a total of 179,000 men in our Armed Forces. Under the spur of war this number skyrocketed upward until, by Armistice Day, November 11, 1918, the total had reached 4,282,000. Then the pendulum swung into reverse at a dizzying pace. In less than 2 years after the end of World War I the number of men under arms was back down to 344,000.

The downward trend continued for another 2 years. Then the size of our Armed Forces reached another low level which continued from 1922 to 1935. The number of men on duty during those years ranged between 243,845 and 270,027. By June 30, 1939, shortly before Hitler invaded Poland, the total climbed to 334,473. When France fell, a year later, our strength was still short of half a million. The exact figure was 458,297 on June 30, 1940.

It was not until the Selective Service Act was passed on September 16, 1940, that rapid increase of military manpower got under way. Even then our progress was far from assured. Continuation of selective service squeezed through Congress by the margin of a single vote the following year, only a few months before Pearl Harbor. When we entered into actual conflict, under conditions of total war, all restraints were dropped. We reached a peak strength of 12,124,418 on May 31, 1945.

After VJ-day we began the familiar process of casting away our strength with breakneck speed. By March 31, 1948, despite the evidences of Soviet duplicity in the United Nations, our strength had sunk to a postwar low of 1,398,726.

The facts of Soviet imperialism forced a new upswing. Selective Service was reactivated and our strength climbed to 1,668,492 on January 31, 1949. Emphasis on budget economies again reversed the trend. The number of men in service slipped off to 1,460,261 on June 30, 1950. Again an acute crisis forced us to swift action. The outbreak of hostilities in Korea started us on the road to a force adequate to provide genuine security. On March 21, 1951, General Marshall was able to inform the President that we had more than doubled the force we had when the Communists made their unprovoked attack across the thirty-eighth parallel on June 25, 1950. Our present strength is more than 3,500,000 and our immediate goal is a total of 3,700,000 to be attained as soon as possible.

The peak and valley concept of defense which has marked our past record has been extremely wasteful. It has provided no real security. On the contrary, during the past 3 decades this Nation has been involved in three wars, two of them among the greatest and most destructive in all history. Our vacillation has invited disregard and, indeed, contempt by other nations for our peaceful purposes. It has encouraged the belief among those aggressors who conspire to destroy us that we will always relax our vigilance if they delay any overt attack long enough.

Certain foreign writers have expressed the opinion that Russia's foreign policy might have been very different in recent years if the United States had not stripped itself of reserve military manpower after the end of World War II. But the Armed Services, for reasons which they have never explained, deliberately ignored the mandate of Congress, which was contained in the Selective Service Act of 1940 and was specifically extended by Congress when the old Selective Service Act expired, requiring that the veterans of World War II should be placed in a Reserve status for a period of 10 years after they were discharged from active service.

For a time it appeared that the Services might comply with these directives, but the Judge Advocate General of the War Department came to the conclusion that the President had authority to grant unconditional discharges under another Act of Congress. The Armed Services thereafter proceeded to discharge the millions of men who had

served in World War II without transferring them to any Reserve status, and the major purpose of Congress to create a large trained reserve was defeated.

It was then that Communist Russia started its program of promoting wars—cold and hot—in widely scattered sections of the world—wars which the men of the Kremlin have cunningly contrived to have fought by the people of other nations, while they artfully preserved their own manpower and military resources.

At the same time the American people, deluded by political programs of false economy, had permitted our other defenses to sink to a new low level, which encouraged our present enemies to believe, as Hitler and Mussolini had done before them, that the democratic form of government is essentially weak and vacillating, and easy to overthrow.

Of course it is true that modern wars cannot be won by manpower alone. But it is equally true that our enemies regard manpower as a vitally important factor in military preparedness and lean heavily upon it in actual warfare, as has been demonstrated in Korea. We know that the nations which are our potential enemies today have reserves of trained manpower which are numerically far greater than we can hope to muster. With this grim reality confronting us, it would be suicidal for the American people to fail to develop all of our military resources, including manpower, for any emergency which may occur in the future.

Scan the world horizons as you will, my colleagues, you can discern no sign of real and enduring peace.

Today we are confronted again with a spectacle of stark realism in far away areas of this blood-stained world—a spectacle of ruthless aggression which can only be resisted by military power. This hideous spectacle has convinced me that the only way to preserve the liberties and the freedoms of the American way of life is to make and keep all of our national defenses so strong that no foe will dare to attack us.

That is why I am supporting this bill.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the main issue of the controversy now before us has largely been obscured by the smoke of battle. That is, whether or not the passage of this measure, permitting the Congress or the President to put into effect universal military training at any time, will enhance the security of our country.

Our very able, distinguished, and much-beloved chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], said in the well of this House on Tuesday last, and I quote:

War can be brought to our own shores in a matter of hours.

I accept that statement, because I recognize in our chairman one of the best-qualified men in the country to report to us whether our country is in immediate danger. He has so reported. Therefore, should we use our money, our

matériel, and our manpower all in one direction, namely, the selective service, build it up quickly, as rapidly, and as strongly as we can to be able to meet this threat? Or should we divide our powers by setting up a universal military training program on one side and having selective service on the other, dividing our money, our matériel, and our manpower between the two? Which will strengthen America the most at the moment? And our chairman says the danger is imminent. I think the answer to that question is obvious: We should give everything we have now to selective service, because we have it. We will save money by so doing.

That brings up another question: Much talk has been had on the floor of this House about the cost, and the statement has been made many times that ultimately we will save upward of \$13,000,000,000. Assuming that is true, what about the present situation? Will we save it this year, next year, 5 years from now, or 10 years from now? No one has told me when this saving will be effected. What about today? The testimony before our committee is to the effect that the first year it will cost \$4,000,000,000 and \$2,000,000,000 or more each year for some time to come. My experience with Army estimates as to what things will cost is generally that they are about 50 percent of the actual cost.

I am asking you, Will it strengthen the security of the country to burden our economy with additional expense now? Or will it weaken it? How can we pass a bill in this House that will make possible the expenditure of \$4,000,000,000 or more the first year in addition to what we are now expending without at the same time voting another bill to increase the taxes on the American people?

Disregarding whether it may be a saving in the long run, are we not today interested with the concern of America now and the threat to our shores now? I am not an expert and I do not propose to be an expert on whether or not universal military training put into operation in the year 1952 will increase the security of our country, keep it as it is now, or decrease it; but I have some very good authority on pages 2454 and 2455 of the hearings. I quote. I am the interrogator:

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. General Collins, do you feel, in your opinion, the security of America would be increased by putting UMT into effect in 1952?

General COLLINS. Yes; I do.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Well, when you say that are you not indicting the present Selective Service System?

General COLLINS. No; I am not.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Well, just why would it increase it and how?

General COLLINS. Well, it would increase it not as of 1952, frankly, but as of 1953, 1954, 1955, 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, 1960.

Then again on page 2455 this question directed to General Collins, Chief of Staff of the Army:

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. In an emergency. I haven't yet seen how this program would increase the security of America at the present time.

General COLLINS. At the present time, no. I would agree with you.

There is additional colloquy on the page but I have read the questions and the direct answer of General Collins that it would not increase the security of America now. Our chairman has said that the danger is now. Then why go to something that will not increase it? Why not put everything we have toward the instrumentality, the organization we already have built up to secure America that is working satisfactorily?

There is another part of this bill that bothers me and I have not had a very satisfactory answer, although it is answered in a way in the hearings, and that is what the effect on our National Guard will be. Remember that the Constitution of the United States says that each of the several States shall have an organized militia. A gentleman testified before our committee, General Walsh, president of the National Guard Association of the United States, and I quote from the hearings, pages 2852 and 2853 as follows:

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. General Walsh, as I understood the testimony, you believe that if the bill is passed that is now before us without amendment, it would mean ultimately the end of the National Guard?

General WALSH. Exactly.

The CHAIRMAN. What?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. It would mean the end of the National Guard ultimately.

General WALSH. Exactly. If all the other Reserve groups, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, are going to have this product channeled into those calls, and we are to get none, then it is the end.

Then on page 2853 our distinguished chairman went back to this question, and I quote the following:

The CHAIRMAN. Let me clear up one question that the general answered to Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. CUNNINGHAM said if this bill passes like it is, what effect it has on the National Guard and the general answered that is the end of the National Guard.

General WALSH. In due course.

The CHAIRMAN. What?

General WALSH. In due course.

The CHAIRMAN. In what?

General WALSH. In due course.

The CHAIRMAN. In due course. Well, I would like to know—you have been getting along pretty well for the last 20 years when we didn't have any law like this on the statute books.

General WALSH. We didn't have any UMT for the last 20 years, Mr. Chairman.

You may wonder why this bill in its present form would mean the end of the National Guard, as contemplated by General Walsh. I believe I can tell you. It would kill it by strangulation and suffocation. The armed services branches here in Washington and this Commission would have the sole power to determine what, if any, of these troops were channeled into the National Guard. As a former officer of the National Guard I know how difficult it is to get recruits. I know it would be more difficult once this bill is put into operation. Therefore, they would be wholly dependent upon a group in Washington as to whether or not the National Guard remains in existence. I say that is too much power to put into the hands of any man or any group of men.

This bill should have a provision making it mandatory that enough of these trainees be channeled into the National

Guard to keep it up to a definite or required strength.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I have this further question that bothers me about the bill before us and that is it is permanent. It has no limit. Just what does that mean? Let us say it goes into effect and after some years the people of the United States, or a sufficient number of them, do not want it. It is stated that it can come up for review and that the Congress can repeal it at any time. Oh, yes; but could the Congress get a two-thirds vote to pass it over a Presidential veto if it should be vetoed? I think there should be a time limit on this, a definite period, so that it could come up for reconsideration and review and if the people do not want it it might be wiped off the books by a simple majority vote and not have the necessity of getting a two-thirds majority.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. I have in mind offering an amendment which will do the very thing the gentleman suggests should be done; that is, imposing a time limit on this bill.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman. I expect there will be amendments offered by the dozen to take care of objections made on the floor; but I ask the gentleman from New York, why was that not done in committee? I do not believe a bill of this controversial nature should be written on the floor of the House. It should be written in committee. I say right here and now as a member of that committee we could have done a better job.

Mr. COLE of New York. Let me answer the gentleman. The gentleman has been here for nearly if not more than a decade and he knows that every dollar the Government spends for universal military training each year must be appropriated by this Congress. If this Congress does not like the UMT it can refuse to appropriate a single dollar.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I know that, I have heard that statement a dozen times, but is it not ridiculous to pass the buck to the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. COLE of New York. The gentleman does not deny that to be the fact?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. No, I do not.

Mr. Chairman, an atmosphere of hysteria has been built up around this bill due to present world conditions. This is being used as a reason for action now rather than considering the issue coolly and calmly in light of the true facts and whether or not it will increase the security of America now. A bill that will not stand on its own feet in the light of day should never be passed in darkness.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, it is never pleasant for me to disagree with my esteemed colleagues on the committee. But it is necessary for me to follow my conscience and adhere to my own deep convictions on this crucial matter, and that is just what I propose to do.

Let me state, to begin with, that my opposition to this measure is not based upon the view that we do not presently need a strong, powerful national defense to protect the Nation in the grave crisis confronting us. I think that my views in favor of a great and overwhelming armed services establishment comprising air power, naval power, and a modernized army are generally well known to the Members of the House as they are to my own constituents.

It will be recalled that at a previous time when some high officials of this Government were engaged in cutting back our armed services in the name of a false, misguided economy, that I stood steadfastly and vigorously with those on the committee and in the House who were opposing such unwise curtailments, pointing to the dangers that would follow their adoption and urging the rebuilding and the material expansion and strengthening of all our Armed Forces.

It will be recalled, if I may make this statement with pardonable pride, that I was the very first one in this House to introduce legislation calling for the building up of our postwar Air Force to the point where it would constitute an overwhelming striking force capable of instantaneous action, not only to defend the country but to visit swift and terrible retaliation against any nation which dared to attack us or those parts of the free world essential to our security.

It was my thought at that time, as it is today, that we could not move too speedily to create a large fleet of super-transcontinental and intercontinental strategic bombers and other suitable fully modernized aircraft, capable of carrying atomic bombs and every other type of effective explosive weapons to the very heart land of the enemy.

I also urged at various times the speedy construction of appropriate radar screens, the expansion and implementation of the broadest kind of guided-missiles program, the assembling of a great fleet of modernized tanks, the revitalization of our naval forces, the expansion and reorganization of our Army based on modern concepts of warfare, fully mechanized, fully trained in scientific and technological techniques, and fully equipped with the latest and most modern military devices and weapons.

I also favored and worked for the building up of the National Guard and Reserve programs which have been to such amazing extent deliberately neglected and demoralized since the war so that some sort of a case could be made out here for UMT, which, of course, would utilize high-ranking Pentagon officers and officers of the Regular forces in contrast to the National Guard and Reserve programs which largely utilize non-Regular officers drawn largely from our home communities and from among our veterans.

In other words, my colleagues, I have been sincerely and persistently advocating for some time past measures designed to build the best and strongest possible armed strength for the United States so that we might have, not only a lever for our oftentimes hapless diplomacy, but

also that we might hold in our hands the best possible answer to the challenge of the Soviets, the answer of freemen, not slaves, to the threats of Russian aggression and the defense of the United States and the other democracies should it become necessary at any time to protect our cherished freedom and to uphold the values of western civilization.

So I want it to be very distinctly understood that in vigorously opposing this UMT measure that I am at the same time an advocate and a supporter of an impregnable and most powerful armed strength for the Nation.

At this point I would also like to discuss my attitude toward the military. I have heard the military criticized on many occasions just as they are now being criticized on the floor of the House for the vast propaganda efforts and the great pressure machine that they have so materially helped to build in order to take maximum advantage of artificially created hysteria and a sense of crisis in order to put this ill-advised measure through the Congress. This is not the first time that such methods have been used. They were used even throughout the war to try to draft nurses and to try to pass a universal manpower bill which would draft into the national service every man and woman between the ages of 18 and 65. Some of these very ill-considered measures were actually passed by the House, only to die on the other side of the Capitol when the force of an aroused public opinion and maturity of national judgment were able to work upon them.

But I must make it clear that I desire to acknowledge, and I think this fact should be stressed here in this Congress, that the leaders of the armed services as a whole have made, and are making, tremendous contributions to the security and safety of the Nation and to the establishment and conduct of the great national defense so necessary at this time in our history.

The fact that I have disagreed with the military at various times and with respect to various policies has in no wise diminished the high regard which I hold and the admiration, respect, and esteem which I feel for the great ability, zeal, and patriotism of the large body of faithful men, and women too, who are serving the Nation in high military positions.

It is my desire and intention to debate this question just as I have endeavored to think it out, strictly on its merits, and strictly on the basis of whether it is practicable, feasible, necessary for the defense of the Nation, in agreement with our national patterns and traditions, and a proper way to try to build up our Armed Forces.

Many people who are supporting this measure forget that this is a democracy, not an autocracy; that this is a free Government, not a dictatorship; that the American people are a free people and not slaves.

We have historically recognized that in this Nation military power is always subordinate to the civilian authority, and that is a sound principle of American political philosophy and law.

What we have failed to recognize is that coercion, regimentation, enslavement of young American boys is not in accord with these principles and could be justified only by an extreme emergency, and then on only a temporary basis to last as long as the emergency should exist.

This is not Hitler's Germany. This is not Stalin's Russia. This is not even Attlee's England. No man has a vested interest in the Government of the United States, and no man or group of men have the right under color of law, or otherwise, to take away the basic liberties of the American people. The idea of taking 18-year-old boys in peacetime away from their homes, their schools, their churches, their spiritual advisers and leaders, their parents, and drafting them into the armed services is repugnant to American ideals, destructive to American morale, and in time would lead to a pattern of dictatorship in this country.

I know what many of the sponsors of UMT are saying, that it will be a good thing for these boys to be taken into the Army camps where some of them can be fully clothed, properly fed, medically served, and appropriately indoctrinated with American ideals. The patronizing argument runs something like this: "It is a good thing for these boys, so many of whom come from low-grade environments, to be given some discipline and to be compelled to submit to authority. It will make better men of them. Besides, it will feed and clothe them better than at home, and train and educate them better than their teachers and their parents. We will make better citizens out of them."

To my mind such arguments are not only specious, but they are surcharged with fallacy of the worst kind. For the most part, the parents of America know how to bring up their children. The schools and colleges of America know how to teach and instruct them, and religious leaders of America of every denomination, who are almost universal and active and outspoken in their opposition to this measure, can inculcate them with spiritual values and patriotic ideals better than any one in the Army can.

This argument is derived from a superior, supercilious attitude toward our young men and their parents and their teachers and their ministers, priests, and rabbis. It presupposes that certain people in this Nation, because of some self-impressed and self-designated super-patriotism, must, in the spirit of benevolent despotism, take over the training of young men and shape and mold them into good citizens after their own fashion.

How can we know into whose hands this great power of indoctrinating, of shaping, of modeling our young men, will ultimately fall? Will it be merely the militarists, or will it be Fascists, or even pro-Communists, who will indoctrinate and train them? These are questions that every Member of the House should pose for himself before he votes on this measure, because this proposal is not merely to deal with an emergency. This

proposal is meant to deal with American youth of every future generation. This is regular peacetime conscription of the type practiced in the past to the sorrow and disaster of many of the great monarchial nations of Europe, who found in the long run that it furnished absolutely no guaranty against aggression, but in most cases brought the nations adopting it and practicing it down into the shambles of conquest, decadence, degeneration, and ruin.

Is it any wonder that great thoughtful patriotic spiritual leaders throughout the entire country are opposing this measure so wholeheartedly and almost unanimously? They will see the destruction of ideals and values of American life which is entailed in this measure.

The labor unions are almost unanimous in their opposition to UMT, because their leaders well know what dictatorship and dictatorial government hold for working men and women, and they well know that in the end, as all history proves, such measures can lead only to the chains of bondage and enslavement. The farm and agricultural organizations, the country over, are dismayed by this proposal, as they have been by the inequities of the operation of selective service, and they are largely opposing it.

Teachers and educational associations, and leaders in the schools and colleges have spoken out against this unwise measure, because they know it will do irreparable violence to the entire structure of American education—the best in the world.

But it is in the homes of America, among the fathers and mothers and sisters and brothers of the boys whom this measure would herd into totalitarian regimentation that the strongest, if not always articulate, opposition comes.

But, believe me, there will come a time next November when all these groups of people will have the chance to express themselves—the churches, the workers, and farmers of America, the educators, the relatives, the parents—all the vast company of loyal Americans who abhor dictatorship of any kind will have their opportunity to speak and to act. They will not be inarticulate then. They will amply demonstrate their resentment of efforts to regiment our boys into an unnecessary peacetime conscription, indenture, and serfdom. They will then record their determination to protect our freedom and our way of life on that day of all days when they can choose their representatives in this Capitol.

I would like to supplement somewhat my statements about the Reserve program. Everyone knows that the Reserve program has been shamefully neglected in order to justify UMT. Everyone knows that the Defense Department has not spent the money which various Congresses have appropriated since the end of the war to build up our Reserves.

Despite this failure, however, the fact is that we now have a sizable Reserve of over two and a half million men, including large numbers of veterans, who have voluntarily enlisted. The great leaders of the Reserves have been put in the position of mendicants begging the

Department "to do something with what we have now," to quote General Evans who is in charge of the program.

The Volunteer Reserve should have been trained and compensated for drills, and screened to eliminate the unfit. There was nothing wrong with the procedure, but for five long years virtually nothing was done to interest these officers and men to keep themselves properly trained and ready for call. That is the testimony.

The National Guard had the same experience. As General Walsh, president of its association, testified, if all Army and Air National Guard units and organizations had been phased into the active military service in an orderly fashion in connection with the present emergency, many of our manpower difficulties would have been resolved, particularly where veterans were concerned.

We all know the terrible inequities and injustices that accompanied the recall of veterans who, in so many cases, were compelled to give up their little businesses, their plans for homemaking and family life, and jobs holding out the promise of a bright future, because they were "not properly phased," to use the language of General Walsh.

The evidence is that at a time when the Defense Department should have been planning to expand and build up the Reserves it was following the opposite course of cutting them back, removing incentives, slowing down the Reserve recruitment program, and generally putting the damper on both the Reserves and the National Guard.

The evidence is that if the Army had done its duty and supported the Guard and the Reserves and made a sincere, earnest, and determined effort to build them up, there would be no need of UMT.

To illustrate, in 1949 we had 18,000 units in the United States. By an order of October 1949, issued by the Chief of Staff, these Reserves were cut to 9,000 units. UMT will do nothing whatever to build up the Reserves, because under this proposal, apart from brief annual training for 7½ years, the trainee is subject to call only when the President, or rather the Congress, declares an emergency, and he cannot be compelled to join a drilling or training unit of the Reserves.

Moreover, it is clear that in the event trainees are called in an emergency they will to all intents and purposes have to be trained all over again. They will have to be physically reconditioned and brought up to date on the latest weapons and developments. That is the undisputed evidence.

Great military experts believe that UMT would be a definite handicap to the national defense. This view is set forth by the celebrated Hanson W. Baldwin in the New York Times, February 15, 1935.

Pointing to the discrimination in the UMT program—different pay, different training, and different privileges—he stated that—

There are many within the military service who have grave misgivings about the present legislation and are anxious to see any attempt to implement it deferred at least

for the duration of the present emergency. Some of these critics are men high in both civilian and military posts in Washington, but most of them, following the party line of policy, will not speak out publicly.

Mr. Baldwin, quoting General Wood, retired tank commander in World War II, as having informed Congress that—

From the standpoint of national security which should be the only basis of consideration—UMT as now planned will cost enormous sums of money without providing any security whatever, or in any way deterring possible aggressors.

On the other hand, the continuation of the draft or a requirement of universal military service for 18 months to 2 years seems inevitable for a long period ahead.

Another military official on a high echelon is quoted as stating:

As long as we have limited funds, UMT is a luxury we can't afford.

You don't stockpile a guy you can teach on the production line in 30 to 120 days.

As Mr. Baldwin states, the real problem of mobilization is not, and never has been, the training of large masses of military manpower, but the manufacture of arms and equipment and the organization of units.

He also posed three very disturbing problems UMT would give rise to—the huge cost; the deferment problem, that is, how to take some boys for 6 months' training and others for 2 years' service; and thirdly, the personnel problem, that is, the rapid exhaustion of presently available military manpower in the 18-to-26 age bracket, admittedly a problem that will always be with us. He and other well-informed and notable commentators have also voiced the view which I have held and expressed for some time past, namely, that UMT has little relation indeed to military reality in an atomic age.

It is my considered opinion that this bill not only has dangerous and alarming social and political implications, but, as Mr. Baldwin has said, its military features will inevitably complicate tremendously the already muddled and botched-up military manpower situation of the Nation, and should it be put into effect by any chance it will definitely impede and obstruct, rather than help and benefit, our military readiness and preparedness.

I would not lay all the blame for pressing this unwise measure at this time at the door of the Pentagon. I believe, in fact, that most of the pressure currently felt in and about Congress has been and is being exerted by certain civilian leaders who have long been working toward the objective of regimenting American life. Some of these leaders believe that by this means they can offset communism and perhaps install a sort of gracious Fascist regime; others believe, mistakenly I think, that military training is a good thing for an 18-year-old boy. Both groups would not hesitate to urge general compulsory service as a panacea for peacetime social ills or wartime manpower problems, military or industrial.

These civilian leaders have been able to swing great influence in high Government councils. They have been around for a long time, they know the ropes and

how to pull them. I will not mention any names, but most Members of this House have an idea of the interest, efforts, and methods of these men. Of course, they are entitled to their views just as I am entitled to oppose them in their objective.

This bill is not necessarily pleasing to the proponents of the UMT principle. It is merely the best thing they could get now. They had worked and hoped for a stronger measure, but because of the political realities in election year they have had to settle for the present inept, multifarious, watered-down measure. They should have liked universal military service for a 2-year period, but, in their desperation to start the program, will take this bill. The present political conditions make such a prospect of 2 years' service utterly unthinkable, as the astute gentleman from Georgia knows perhaps better than any man in this House. In fact, I think the gentleman is willing to do some more watering down.

I am as much dissatisfied with the functioning of the draft as any other Member who has carefully observed it and watched its various maladjustments of our current manpower pools. Primary responsibility for this situation must rest with the Congress; we cannot escape it. There have been the gravest mistakes as well as the most asinine policies in the mobilization and assignment of manpower. But I submit that selective service can and should continue to handle these problems. I have more and greater faith in the essential wisdom, knowledge, and fairness of General Hershey than in many other administrators I have seen around Washington. At present Congress has vested him with complete and well-rounded powers. He can use them to secure as much manpower as is needed in this emergency. What many fail to remember is that, as compared with some other nations and their allies, we have limited manpower, and we therefore should carefully allocate it as between industry, agriculture, general productive services, and the armed services, with as little compulsion as possible.

I have had occasion before to urge the modernization of our Armed Forces to accord with our advanced technology. Current day fighters must not only fight, but they must understand a large number and variety of highly scientific weapons and gadgets. The problems presented by jet-propelled aircraft, radar, rockets, guided missiles, the atomic bomb, and other scientific innovations which have so radically changed warfare, require for their proper solution not a cumbersome, inept format like UMT, but a thoroughly professionalized, streamlined, highly trained personnel familiar with the special problems of the air, the sea and its subsurfaces, and ground fighting as well. If the Department of Defense had been on the job since the end of World War II, it could have used some of the more than \$100,000,000,000 appropriated to it by the Congress to set up, mobilize and train, in local communities throughout the country, industrial reserves who would be thoroughly indoctrinated in all complicated industrial mechanisms, scientific inventions, and

methods applicable to modern warfare. Working together with other Reserves and the National Guard, such units could have been of inestimable value in meeting our defense needs.

It is about time military leaders appreciated the fact that having paper pools in their files and records of young men trained for 6 months only under antiquated techniques will never provide the answer either to our manpower or defense needs. It is about time, as I have urged before, that our military and civilian leadership took sweeping actions to revise not only our thinking and our basic concepts, but our entire organization of the armed services, together with the industrial and economic production resources so vitally essential to their success in wartime.

There can be no question in my mind that UMT instead of facilitating and helping provide such a program, because it is so ponderously based on old-fashioned and discredited military notions, can serve only to complicate and encumber the draft process as well as to hinder and obstruct the proper solution of our manpower problems in a thoroughly American manner and in accordance with sound American principles.

Admittedly, there are elements of weakness in our present military status and position, as Korea has demonstrated. But that has not been the only thing we have learned from Korea. It has served to emphasize the serious weaknesses in our diplomacy and foreign policy and those responsible for conducting them.

But we must not live with our weaknesses. Rather must we move to eliminate them, to be in a position to meet any attack that might be made upon the Nation, not to waste what we have, whether it is money, resources, or manpower, or military strength.

Our potential enemy has the greatest of weaknesses which derive from an enslaved people, from a crackpot, unworkable economic system, and from Messianic leaders fanatically devoted to the devilish cause of human enslavement.

Such a system cannot be sustained for long. It has within itself the seeds of its own destruction. In time the unfortunate people held behind the iron curtain in a more cruel bondage than history has ever recorded will, through God's help, and through the help of enlightened inspired men, find liberation.

Until that time comes, we must be prepared for action at a moment's notice. We cannot tolerate softness, sappiness, sentimentalism, appeasement, or procrastination, either in diplomacy or preparation for war. We must mobilize all the resources of our great, rich, free country and have them ready if the brazen, impudent zealots of the Marxist world should decide to attack us, or to move further to threaten our security.

Everything is not in order in the Department of Defense, but it should be put in order, and this Congress can and must do its full share to this end. If there is corruption, waste, and extravagance in the armed services, certainly they should be sought out by our committee and ruthlessly expunged. If there is incompetence or radicalism anywhere in this

great system of defense, these, too, should be eradicated.

It is clear to me that the unification of the armed services has produced great, new problems which apparently never occurred to its sponsors. But we cannot tarry now in this crisis to reshape that basic organization. We must try to make it work, try to make it serve our needs for a modernized, streamlined, realistic defense of the United States, and a swift-moving, overpowering, striking force that can inflict frightful destruction and devastation upon our enemies.

If we forge and fashion such a powerful, efficient system, it will not only serve to deter aggression, as air power and the atomic bomb are now doing, but it will serve to deter aggression long after the Russians have fully implemented the atomic bomb, because the Russians will know that with our great productive forces fully mobilized and implemented by new weapons, united in spiritual strength, that the United States will be invincible in battle and unconquerable as a nation.

It may even serve to pave the way for peace in this troubled world by impressing the Soviets with the futility of ever gaining a conquest over us. In fact, I am convinced that the only way that nation, or any other nation, can gain a conquest over us will be through our own apathy, indifference, and inaction, through our own lack of vigilance in protecting the high ideals and great spiritual values which underlie the Nation, through our own ghastly error in yielding to the siren songs of social uplifters and reformers who would lure us on to the rocks of collectivism and ultimate doom.

I hope and urge that this measure will be voted down by my colleagues. It is contrary to American principles, it is unwise, it is inadequate, it is dictatorial, it is a violation of all the values we hold dear. I propose to vote against it for the reasons I have set forth, and I earnestly hope that the House will reject it.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, in my judgment, this proposal as presently drafted should be recommitted. It should be recommitted for several reasons:

First, in my judgment it will not bolster up, it will not shore up, it will not augment our military defense at the present time. In effect, as presently drafted, it will weaken our military preparedness in the current crisis. In my judgment, and I take the opposite point of view from the distinguished majority leader, a vote for recommitment is a vote for strength and a vote against recommitment is a vote for weakness.

Secondly, in my judgment, it should be recommitted because it seems to me in the last 20 months those in charge of the planning of our military establishment have failed miserably. I intend to and will vote for universal military training when the record of those in charge of our Military Establishment merits it, when on the record they can prove they can handle a job of this magnitude.

I would like to make several other comments before discussing the proposal. A properly drafted and well-run universal military training program will not militarize our youth. My own experiences in World War II for some 47 months did not militarize me; as a matter of fact, I think that I left the service more opinionated than ever against a military regime and military rules and regulations.

Secondly, percentagewise I believe there are as many God-fearing gentlemen, as many men of moral standing in the military as there are in civilian life.

Thirdly, I cannot help but believe to a degree that some military training for all youths is highly desirable, particularly at a time when we are faced with a great international crisis.

With those basic views on the record, I would like to discuss for just a few minutes this question: Does this bill as presently proposed answer the problem we face as a Nation today? In my judgment, it does not.

In the first place, H. R. 5904 is discriminatory. Let us take this example in order to show just what will or might happen. Suppose anyone of us in this Chamber had a pair of twins, and for illustrative purposes we will call one "selectee" and one "trainee." For illustration, both of them are 19 years old.

According to this legislation the selectee would serve 2 years on active duty and then go into the Reserve. His twin brother, the trainee, would go on active duty for 6 months and then spend the next 6½ years on inactive duty. I fail to see how one can say this particular proposal is not discriminatory. Under the bill, 5,000 young men each month will go into training under UMT, and 40,000 or thereabouts will go on active duty under selective service.

The second point is this: The name universal military training is a misnomer. This proposal provides for no more universal military training than the present Selective Service Act, and the evidence of that is clearly set forth in the committee report. The committee report says there will be just as many deferments, and just as many reasons for deferments under universal military training as provided under this act as there are in selective service. Several months ago I received a letter from a man who serves on an appeal board in my congressional district. He said, "Congressmen you have to vote for universal military training because it will truly provide for universal military training." The facts are this act does not provide for universal military training. It gives all the exemptions and all the deferments that we now have under Selective Service.

The third point is this: I take this from my own particular experience. Under H. R. 5904, the young men will be called in to military training service for 6 months. I can visualize those that are assigned to the Navy going to Great Lakes for boot training. They will probably spend 3 or 4 months in boot training, learning the rudiments and the fundamentals of naval service. From there they will then go to a service school to learn to become a radar man, a

communications expert or yeoman. At the end of several months in a service school, they would then normally be eligible for active duty at sea. Under this bill, H. R. 5904, that would just about be their 6 months, and then they will go into the Inactive Reserves. In other words, they will never spend any time at sea where a sailor actually learns to become a competent and experienced member of the naval service. In contrast, those who go on active duty under selective service will spend some time in boot training, some time at a service school, and then the remaining months will be spent at sea where they will become a valuable part of our military defense. When they spend 18 months at sea, then they will retire to the Inactive Reserves, but they will be a far better reservist because they will have served at sea, and because they will know how to operate a ship, or part of it, whereas their brothers who went to boot training, and then to service school, and then into the Inactive Reserves, have had no real military experience. For example, the young man who was a trainee and who was in the Inactive Reserves for 2 or 3 years, and then is called up to active duty, I venture to say and I doubt if anyone can contradict this, that he will have to spend another 6-month period in boot training and in service school for refresher training. Then the trainee will serve as an apprentice at sea before he will be an important, experienced, and vital cog in our defense set-up.

The second point, and one of the basic reasons why I object to this legislation is this: I dislike to admit it, but there are good reasons, in my judgment, for the statement that the people in the Pentagon, the top planners, on the basis of performance in the last 20 months, have not merited the authority and far-reaching power in this proposal.

The best evidence is the numerous recent reports by the Hébert subcommittee of the House Committee on Armed Services, the Hardy subcommittee of the House Committee on Expenditures, and the Johnson Subcommittee on Preparedness in the Senate. This pile of documents on the table on my right is a real condemnation of military procurement, planning, and manpower utilization in the last 20 months. It is difficult for me to give such far-reaching authority as sought by this proposal when the military leaders who will guide the program have been so soundly condemned by competent congressional committees.

In conclusion, let me emphasize my disapproval of the bill as brought to the floor of the House. Possibly certain amendments can be approved that will remedy the existing and substantial defects in H. R. 5904. I doubt, however, that my lack of confidence in the powers that be in the executive branch of the Government at this time can be overcome prior to the conclusion of House action on this bill. The last 20 months have produced much talk by the military, horrible waste in manpower and material, and unsound procurement policies of a serious nature. When such weaknesses are eradicated and the record merits it, I will have an open mind on UMT.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, first I want to pay my compliments to the chairman of the great Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. It was not my privilege to serve under him. I left the Committee on Military Affairs just as they merged it with the old Committee on Naval Affairs, but I am happy to join with him in his valiant effort to get some adequate national defense. I am for this bill, and I want to make that point most emphatic.

I also want to pay my compliments to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], with whom I served on the Committee on Military Affairs for 8 years. He knows where I go along with him and where I part with him. He has done valiant service also in accordance with his convictions.

Mr. Chairman, when the Eighty-second Congress enacted the Universal Military Training and Service Act—Public Law 51—last year, the matter of providing for the administration and discipline of the National Security Training Corps was left for later development. H. R. 5904 now before us for consideration implements the Universal Military Training and Service Act on those points.

While it can be said that the principle of universal military training was adopted by Congress in the enactment of the Universal Military Training and Service Act last year, it is apparent, of course, that universal military training will not become an active part of our program of national defense until H. R. 5904 or some further legislation is enacted into law to carry out the general policy established by the enactment of the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

Most Members of the Eighty-second Congress have had an opportunity to study national defense policies very intensively because of our involvement in World War I, World War II, and the Korean war. Our constituents also have had national defense policies uppermost in their thinking much of the time in recent years because of these wars. The thinking of the American public on national defense problems is generally quite clear and is based upon widespread information and understanding. We must bend every effort to consult with our constituents on matters of this kind at all times.

Prior to the outbreak of World War I in 1914, few Americans then living had given much thought to problems of modern warfare, and few Americans foresaw our involvement in that war. With the outbreak of World War I, military leaders started to build up more activity and greater interest in preparedness but the beginning was quite slow because of our historic reliance upon the oceans as barriers between us and Europe, and between us and Asia. Because of the European war I turned my attention to the study of war and preparedness to a limited extent and I watched with great

interest the development of our first legislation reorganizing the Armed Forces of the United States, effective July 1, 1916. That act gave greater emphasis than had previously been given to the development of the Organized Reserve and the National Guard, but we had not had time to go very far by April 1917, when we were plunged headlong into the war.

When I entered the first officers training camp of World War I, I was appalled by our defense impotency and the magnitude of the job before us to achieve adequate preparedness under the stress and strain of active warfare. We had exceedingly good fortune in having strong and experienced allies. Patriotic Americans rallied to the emergency with such vigor and enthusiasm that our Nation made a very creditable record notwithstanding our impotency at the outset of that war.

At the end of the war, however, we demobilized rapidly and put aside our defense problems. At the onset of World War II we were again in the depths of impotency in our national defense. Again we faced a serious handicap in having to build our defenses at great speed and under very trying conditions because of the rapid approach of World War II, and because of the greatly increased tempo in warfare. The response of patriotic Americans to the challenge of World War II was magnificent and our record in that war stands today as one of the greatest achievements of our age. But again at the end of that war we made such a dash for home and our rocking chairs that the whole world was deeply impressed with our determination to sink to complete defense impotency at the greatest possible speed. The appalling thing about this development is that we were on notice that Russia was exceedingly busy building her war power at utmost speed in the very years we were casting off so completely our armed strength.

I have been an advocate of defense self-sufficiency for our Nation ever since my first baptism of fire in the Mexican campaign, but my studies have been primarily directed to the matter of building our armed strength without building a gigantic standing armed force. To me it is exceedingly important that we have stockpiles of strategic and critical materials together with the best possible productive capacity of those materials, rather than an unnecessarily large stockpile of fabricated weapons and equipment that may become obsolete overnight. Still further, I have always advocated the greatest possible number of citizens trained in the basic principles of defense rather than maintenance of a large standing armed force.

Just what constitutes too large a reserve supply of arms and equipment and just what constitutes too large a standing Armed Force must necessarily be dependent upon world conditions, but generally speaking we must maintain our ability to produce new and more modern weapons quickly in any emergency, and that cannot be done unless we have reserve stocks of basic materials. Likewise, we must be able in any great

emergency to expand our Armed Forces to numbers far beyond anything we can afford in permanent organization. If our citizens generally have basic training and knowledge of weapons and ammunition, our mobilization and our launching of combat team training can move ahead much faster. The tempo of modern warfare increases the importance of this factor. With modern weapons, the time for basic training may not be available after the first attack is made on us. We will need to bend every effort to build fighting teams of men already trained and skilled in the handling of their weapons.

In the field of sports, American colleges today would not think of placing prep school football stars on the gridiron in any intercollegiate game without giving those men thorough training as a team. Our American colleges seldom succeed in developing an outstanding football player during his 4-year college course unless he has learned and carried out basic football training before he enters college. Yet there are people today who think we can hurl untrained men into war and give them both basic training and team training after actual combat is under way and the lives of those men and the very existence of our Nation are in jeopardy.

Universal military training alone will not win a war. Six months of such training will not save 6 months of mobilization time, but it will save several months of time in getting to combat team training. Some review of basic training received years before a war, and practically all team training, will still be needed after such mobilization is started. It is my firm belief that the saving of 3 months time in launching team training for large numbers of combat units at the outset of any future world war may make the difference between our gaining superiority over the enemy and being rocked back on our heels even to the point of defeat.

I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 26 the final report on my questionnaire. It appears at page A1203 of the Appendix of the RECORD. I put it there because I thought it was important to bring to the House some better picture of the thinking in the State of Iowa than we are getting from our mail. The question on universal military training was right down in the middle of the questionnaire, so as not to emphasize it unduly, and I got a frank opinion from my constituents without emphasizing that question over the other 52 questions.

I tried to get the returns into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD before any issue came up for consideration in this House. It happens that universal military training is the first one to come up for consideration, and therefore the returns on UMT are rather interesting at this time.

Notwithstanding the overwhelming mail I got against universal military training, my questionnaire from every fifth householder shows a far different story.

The principal difference between my sampling of opinion in my congressional district and other congressional questionnaires that have been brought to my attention is in the method of distri-

bution. I have described that method quite fully in my final report that appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so I will not review that point here except to say that I have made a special effort to make this distribution to the people of my district on a completely nonpartisan basis.

In my questionnaire universal military training was given no special emphasis. You will find it listed as the fifteenth of 17 special questions on war policies and defense policies. The answers to my question on universal military training are of special importance at this time because this issue happens to be the first major issue covered by my questionnaire to come before Congress after the distribution of my questionnaire.

I call your attention to the percentage return of the replies of my constituents on the question of universal military training; 53.79 percent voted in favor of universal military training and 46.21 percent were opposed. Because of the unusual interest of my colleagues in the returns by occupation we have taken the time to tabulate our returns on all questions by occupations. I will list here the total vote on universal military training by occupation:

Business:	
Yes.....	435
No.....	241
Labor:	
Yes.....	444
No.....	203
White collar:	
Yes.....	217
No.....	121
Professional:	
Yes.....	298
No.....	217
Farmer:	
Yes.....	316
No.....	662
Miscellaneous:	
Yes.....	268
No.....	255

That much for the general returns to the questionnaire. I think it is worth your while to study the returns by classifications. I have heard it said that the labor union leaders are unanimously opposed to UMT. My householders made returns by occupation. It happens that labor in my district voted 444 to 203 in favor of universal military training. That is better than 2 to 1; almost 2½ to 1. It is the strongest percentage of any classification in my district.

I sincerely hope that this information will be of some interest to Congress at this time as an indication of the basic thinking of the people of my district on the general question of universal military training.

Members of Congress who may be opposed to the legislation now before us can immediately challenge the application of my questionnaire to the pending legislation on the basis that they object to certain features of the bill now under consideration, even though they may favor universal military training as a general policy. My warning to those Members is that from 1919 to 1951 the matter of universal military training did not come to a vote in Congress, notwithstanding the lessons learned in World War I and World War II. The Members of Congress who believe in universal

military training and who oppose the legislation now before Congress by their opposition to this bill have assumed a very serious responsibility. If this bill is enacted into law at this time they have a very real responsibility to do everything within their power to perfect the law after its enactment. If this bill is defeated their responsibility is even greater to bring forth and urge enactment of legislation for UMT at the earliest possible date. We dare not wait another 30 years as we have waited since 1919.

However, if we wait for 435 Members to come into unanimous accord on all the details of every piece of legislation, God save America. We do not have that much time.

In my study of universal military training I have given first consideration to the availability of an adequate number of trained troops for combat. I have given consideration also to the welfare of the individual citizen who is called upon to defend our Nation in war. Heretofore we have been able to train most of our men, but not all of them, before committing them to combat. As the tempo of war increases, however, we can be caught where greater numbers of untrained men must be hurled into combat with such inadequate training as to make their death in battle little short of murder. Some of us have had this lesson vividly brought home to us. I recall deploying a company of about 160 men and moving them forward into combat in the Mexican campaign when more than half of them had never fired a 30 caliber rifle because they had reported for duty only a few weeks before and we were in the midst of the early stages of our training when we were called upon to commit them to combat. No American soldier wants to experience more than once the feeling of insecurity that I experienced on that occasion.

I have today secured from the Armed Service Committee staff an estimate of the number of men now serving in the Armed Forces who are less than 26 years of age. Their estimate is 2,500,000 men in that age range. I requested also an estimate of the number of men in that age range who are no longer in the armed services but who have had sufficient service to be listed as veterans. Their estimate is 2,000,000 men.

I should add that the classification of veteran is given to any man who has had as much as 90 days active duty between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, or who has served for 1 year between September 16, 1940, and June 24, 1948, or who has been discharged after June 24, 1948, with 3 years or more of service.

In our Armed Forces today we have a total strength of 3,500,000 men and women. Of this number more than 40,000 are women.

At the highest point in World War II our total Armed Forces reached a strength of 11,000,000. Some of you will recall that at the time of the Battle of the Bulge men were hurled into combat with shortened training in enough instances to cause considerable heat here in Congress. That occurred while we had an Armed Force of approximately 11,000,000. If you give credit to modern

weapons speeding up the tempo of war, I believe you will agree with me that it is highly advisable to increase the number of our trainees in the age range 18 to 25, inclusive, beyond the number we have today. Furthermore, I believe you will agree with me that it is well nigh impossible for us to continue permanently a standing Armed Force of the size we have today, namely, 3,500,000. However, to the extent our reservoir of trained manpower fails to reach the number we will need for any emergency we will be faced with one of two choices. Either we must maintain a larger standing Armed Force than we can afford, or we must face the possibility of committing untrained troops to combat in any future war before they have had an opportunity to secure adequate training.

My son has just got back from Korea. He spent two winters in combat in Korea as an infantry reservist; and he tells me that we have need for more forces in Korea today, and they must be well trained. He also says the boys there want to win. God save America from ever going into war where you are willing to settle for a stalemate. Spending the lives of these fine boys for a stalemate! Let us finish the job; let us win this war.

Defeat could take us into the salt mines of Russia. Answer me. What has become of those German prisoners of war, civilian and military? Answer me. What has become of the Japanese soldiers that were taken prisoner on the Pacific side?

I have put in the RECORD from time to time excerpts of historic references to the nature of the Russians.

Well, you had warning. De Tocqueville told us in 1835 what to expect.

Referring to the United States and Russia, he told us:

Their starting point is different, and their courses are not the same, yet each of them seems to be marked out by the will of heaven to sway the destinies of half the globe.

Lord Palmerston told us about the methods of the Russians:

The policy and practice of the Russian Government has always been to push forward its encroachments as fast and as far as the apathy or want or firmness of other governments would allow it, but always to stop and retire when it was met with decided resistance.

You know their characteristics. I will not quote further than this because I have not the time.

Commodore Perry gave us a very sound warning in 1856 from the Pacific side. Read your history. Figure out your adversary.

During his famous Asiatic cruise Commodore Perry not only visited the Japanese Empire and other islands of that region but also the mainland of eastern Asia. He was thus able to interpret realistically the movements he discerned.

Commodore Perry presented a paper before the American Geographical and Statistical Society, at a meeting held March 6, 1856, in New York City, from which I quote as follows:

It requires no sage to predict events so strongly foreshadowed to us all; still westward will the course of empire take its way.

But the last act in the drama is yet to be unfolded, and notwithstanding the reasoning of political empires—westward, northward, and southward—to me it seems that the people of America will, in some form or other, extend their dominion and their power until they shall have brought within their mighty embrace multitudes of the islands of the great Pacific, and placed the Saxon race upon the eastern shores of Asia; and I think, too, that eastward and southward will her great rival of future aggrandizement—Russia—stretch forth her power to the coast of China and Siam, and thus the Saxon and the Cossack will meet once more, in strife or in friendship, on another field. Will it be in friendship? I fear not. The antagonistic exponents of freedom and absolutism must thus meet at last, and then will be fought that mighty battle on which the world will look with breathless interest, for on its issue will depend the freedom or the slavery of the world—despotism or rational liberty must be the fate of civilized man. I think I see in the distance the giants that are growing up for that fierce and final encounter; in the progress of events that battle must sooner or later inevitably be fought.

It is my sincere hope that we can avoid this fierce and final encounter between Russia and America that was predicted so definitely by Commodore Perry in 1856. To do so we must know and understand our adversary and we must know our own strength and our own weaknesses. Then we must build a sound economy and develop to the utmost the sinews of our country. In doing this we must rely on the understanding and sound judgment of the American people themselves.

Let us get some adequate national defense before it is too late. I cannot be contented with all this tweedledee and tweedledum about "ifs" and "ands" and "buts"; let us get together, let us get adequate defense, let us get this matter straightened out.

A lot has been said about costs. Of course it costs less to train a man part time than it does full time. It is a question of how many trainees you want.

In my judgment we should train all available and able-bodied young men so that they can defend themselves and their country with the least possible delay after shooting starts in any future war in which we may become involved.

Four and one-half million trained men out of the 8,000,000 between 18 and 25 years of age, inclusive, is not enough, and we most certainly cannot afford for long a standing Armed Force of the present size of 3,500,000 men.

I commend Chairman VINSON and the Committee on Armed Services for their excellent analysis in the committee report of the cost of maintaining our Armed Forces. They point out the very real saving that can be had by cutting down the size of our standing forces and placing greater reliance upon Ready Reserves who have received the training contemplated in our universal military training program. I am particularly impressed with the fact that we cannot permanently maintain an Armed Force in excess of 2,000,000 men. I am also convinced that we dare not place our entire reliance upon a standing Armed Force of 2,000,000 men and our historically small Reserve and National Guard force of less than 1,000,000 men. All of

the discussion and predictions regarding push-button warfare do not convince me that we can afford to cut down our total available defense trained manpower to 3,000,000 men when we had more than 10,000,000 men under arms at the end of World War II.

On page 27 of the committee report—House Report No. 1376—the military personnel cost alone for food, clothing, pay, and shelter, is \$2,100 for the first year of a member's service, and if all costs of service are considered, including departmental overhead, equipment, supplies, and so forth, each man costs the Government \$11,000 for each year in service. By way of contrast, our Government can develop one trained man in the Ready Reserve at a total cost of \$1,400 for 1 year of such training and service.

The committee report compares also the cost of training for the 6-month period contemplated in this legislation, and I quote the committee report as follows:

Even in regard to the cost of training for the 6-month period, a savings will be effected. Six-month training for one draftee for service costs the Government \$3,200, while 6-month UMT training after full implementation costs the Government \$2,700, a saving of \$500. These savings are not inconsequential.

I should add that the universal military trainee can pass back to civilian life and another trainee can be given his place immediately in the training program so that at the end of 2 years of service for the member of the standing armed force we would have four basically trained citizens at a much less cost than the cost to our Government for maintaining the one member of the Armed Forces continuously for 2 years. When this savings is multiplied by the number of basically trained men we need, I am impressed by three points, namely: First, in training enough men to meet our war needs the total savings to our Nation will be tremendous; second, our citizens will have a better knowledge and understanding of how to defend themselves effectively in combat; and, third, our Nation will have the number of basically trained men it needs for defense.

The cost of maintaining our defense bears directly on our economy and our fiscal stability, and full consideration of these factors argues strongly for universal military training rather than tremendous and costly standing Armed Forces.

I subscribed wholeheartedly to all the safeguards provided in this legislation for the physical, moral, and spiritual well-being of our young men during their training. The quality and extent of our defense preparedness and our reserve power are our best guaranties of peace and the maintenance of our rightful place in the family of nations.

One more factor deserves consideration, namely, the danger of a large standing Armed Force taking over the major portion of our governmental functioning and power.

Our complete dependence upon a large standing Armed Force could soon bring our Nation to the same situation that existed at the transition of the Roman

Republic into the Roman Empire. You will recall Julius Caesar realized that the Roman Republic was at an end at the time he first became consul. Something had to be done, but Caesar knew he could not rely upon the votes of the people against the military power that had been built up in the machinery of civil government. In fact, military control threatened the very existence of Rome. In order to develop his own position, Caesar demanded appointment as Governor of Illyria and Gaul and was so appointed in 58 B. C. Caesar was successful and by senatorial action he was made dictator. Following the Battle of the Actium in 31 B. C. the Roman senate conferred the title of "Augustus" on Augustus Octavius, nephew and adopted son of Julius Caesar, and that date is generally conceded to be the end of the Republic and the establishment of the Roman Empire.

I do not want to see our great Republic evolve into a central Federal Government dominated by a large, standing military organization, and to me the surest safeguard against that development is a policy of holding the size of our standing Armed Forces far below the number of men needed at the outset of any future world war and to have our standing Armed Forces supplemented by the Ready Reserve of citizen graduates of universal military training.

I vigorously support the enactment of this legislation although I am not opposed to some of the amendments which I understand will be given consideration. Other amendments may also be found desirable as the program is carried out, but the important thing, in my mind, is to base our national defense on a relatively small standing Armed Force together with the largest possible number of basically trained Ready Reserves.

Let us get busy and see if we cannot round out a training program that will satisfy our needs under an extreme emergency. We do not need a regular Army, Navy, and Air Force of three and a half million men. We cannot afford that many men. Let us train them in that age range of 18 to 26 and keep our Regular Armed Forces down as nearly as we can to 2,000,000. In the final analysis you can most decidedly have your over-all trained personnel at a lot less cost than we are paying out now for a standing Army of three and a half million men. Think it over. There is a difference of opinion on the Republican side but I place national defense far above partisanship.

Again let me say universal military training is the best possible insurance against war at a price that we can afford to pay.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether I can contribute anything to the discussion of H. R. 5904 in 10 minutes, or not. So much has been said and so eloquently on both sides that I would be presumptuous to restate any arguments already advanced. I became convinced, if I had not already been convinced, of two

things, one thing from each side of the debate.

First, that universal military training is contrary to the ideals upon which this country was founded and is dangerous to the national character of future America.

Second, that it is necessary for this Republic to provide a corps of trained Reserves if it is to proceed without unbearable expense and yet adequately provide for the defense of the Republic.

Now, I am basically opposed to H. R. 5904 because I do not accept the philosophy of the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, that there is no way to provide an adequately trained Reserve without resorting to the plan advanced by H. R. 5904, or a system of universal military training.

Indeed, I think it is with poor grace that the chairman of this committee states that there is no middle ground inasmuch as he was the main promulgator of the scheme which turned over the constitutional obligation of the legislative branch of Government to study and write the legislation on this subject to the executive branch of Government.

Nor am I impressed with the study of the Executive Commission and the legislation written by this Executive Commission on the subject. I note, first, that the Commission called only the witnesses they desired to call. I note, second, that the testimony of these witnesses is confidential and so unavailable to this body for consideration in determining our course of action. Third, I note that, though the subject under consideration was training of boys around the age of 18, only two of all the witnesses appearing before the Commission were in the field of general education. None were in the field of trade school, industrial school, or any of the multitudinous fields of technical training which exist in our civilian society.

I can hardly regard the studies made either by the committee of the House or the Executive Commission either detailed or comprehensive. In fact, the studies are so completely inadequate that nowhere is there a study of or an attempt to even define what basic military training is.

It was basic military training, incidentally, that was supposed to be provided for by the Commission. I asked last April in my speeches on the floor of the House what basic military training is and got no answer. There still is no answer. Well, if the committee or the Commission either one had attacked fundamental definitions and given the slightest consideration to the subject about which they were supposed to be concerned, I am satisfied that the middle course would be as apparent to them as it was apparent to former Secretary of Defense Forrestal, Admiral Ben Moreell, other military leaders and, yes, even a Congressman like myself.

In attacking the problem of any training or educational program, the very first matter that must be considered is what do you want to train or educate for.

So, I ask the simple question which remains unstudied and unanswered,

What are the skills needed in the corps of trained reserves as of 1952 and as best we can project the needs into the immediate future?

Right off the bat anyone who knows the simplest thing about modern warfare as it appeared in World War II and as it appears even more so in 1952, knows that the great bulk of the personnel in the Armed Forces must perform specialized and technical jobs which in essence are noncombat in nature. Estimates may vary, but middle estimate is that 90 percent of those in uniform in the last war were engaged in noncombat activities. Only 10 percent were combat troops.

If this figure is anywhere near correct, we are immediately presented with the fact that only a very small portion of our reserves need combat training. So a great deal of the oratory spent in the debate to the effect that we must prepare our youth to defend themselves is largely beside the point. Of course, we must prepare the 10 percent who might be engaged in combat activity—and I might say, only the military establishments are qualified to train them in combat activity—not, I might state, a civilian commission.

But, the big question, Who is to train the 90 percent in the technical skills? Look at the list in the Commission report of the skills that the Army, Navy and Air Force intend to train this 90 percent under the guise that it is military training. With only two possible exceptions, every one of these skills are civilian skills which our civilian enterprises have been training personnel in for years. The military are not educators or trainers. Our civilian enterprise includes our professional educators and trainers. Obviously, the best ones to train personnel in technical fields are those who are professionally trained and equipped to do it.

Let the military do a job analysis of the technical skills they need and the number of each they need in the event of mobilization. Civilian enterprise can provide it for them.

In essence, this whole matter comes down to whether you believe General Hershey's expression of the military establishments' philosophy when he says—page 195 of last year's hearings:

I would say that in the Armed Forces and in the Navy, as I have observed them, no matter how much they talk about skill, what they want is a young, smart boy, because they can teach him much easier than they can unteach many who come in with a lot of so-called skills but they generally have (a) a skill which is of doubtful value, unless modified, and, (b) a desire to participate only with the skill they have. If there is anything else to be done, they want somebody else to do it. I believe that you just about got to build armies and build navies and build air forces by taking people who have capacity and teaching them what you want them to know, because unfortunately, by and large, in our civilian life the type of man we need, and that is the fighter, is only there as an avocation and not as a vocation.

I do not believe it and when I consider that one of the sorriest jobs performed in World War II was by the Military Establishments in matching civilian

skills with military skills. I am doubly unimpressed. The Seabees, incidentally, was the one branch that proceeded on the opposite of General Hershey's philosophy and what a performance they put on.

I have only been able to suggest a few of the basic matters which must be studied in order to provide the answer to what the chairman presents as an insoluble dilemma. It is hardly insoluble. As I said in April, there is plenty of time to do the job if the Armed Services Committee really has a will to do it. Let us first get our Reserve program set up. Then let us figure out how to keep it filled with trained personnel, utilizing the civilian institutions which are already available for this purpose.

I favor recommitting the bill; however, I believe that, under the circumstances of past performance, the matter should be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor instead of the Armed Services Committee. After all, we are talking about education and training and 90 percent of this training, or at least an extremely high percentage of this training, is not military—it is civilian.

Mr. Chairman, I now commence my extended remarks which the time allotted to me did not permit me to present on the floor.

I am opposed to H. R. 5904 which the Armed Services Committee has dubbed "a bill to provide for the administration and discipline of the National Security Training Corps." This is the bill which the Pentagon has been selling around the country as universal military training. Well, gentlemen, in my opinion it is neither universal, nor military, nor training, and I propose to briefly point out to you the basis for such opinion.

Before embarking upon this discussion, I want to take issue with a statement made by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee and the National Security Training Commission that the Congress has already approved of the idea of universal military training. The chairman of the Armed Services Committee knows full well that he deliberately dodged the issue of considering the approval of the idea of UMT last April when the matter was before the House by refusing to divorce the UMT principle from the extension of the draft. Congressman BARDEN sought to have a clear-cut decision on UMT and the chairman declined. He cannot now be heard to say with any truth or justification that the House did approve the principle of UMT. How many votes were obtained solely on the basis that it was necessary to extend the draft law? Certainly these were the plans used by the proponents to insure the passage of the legislation.

By the chairman's own admission the proposed bill, H. R. 5904, in any of the forms in which it has appeared to date and in any form the chairman's own amendments may change it to, is not universal. There are more exemptions than appear even in the present draft law. It is only to be started, he says, on a wee small basis. Well, any basis other than universality is selectivity.

So, this so-called universal military training bill is not universal.

It is not military. Supposedly it is under civilian control but a thorough reading of the Commission's report shows that it is under military control. To this extent then perhaps the plan is military. However, the training proposed, if training it be, is not military. Refer to page 42 of the Training Commission October 1951 report and tell me what is military in sex education, responsibility, marriage and family life, religion, moral principles, and citizenship. It sounds more like the beginning of Oscar Ewing's dream of national education than a military training program. As a matter of fact, if our family, churches, and schools have not done a job in these fields by the time our boys are 18 I am certain the Military Establishment or a National Security Training Commission is not going to be able to do anything about it. Personally, I will stick with our family, church, and educational institutions on this matter.

Or, if you prefer, turn to page 12 of this same report and see the technical courses offered by the Air Force as part of military training. There are 24 items, every one of which are taught throughout this broad land by civilian schools, trade, or industrial schools or on-the-job training, with the possible exception of "intelligence" and "armament systems." In other words, these skills are essentially civilian skills, not military skills. Certainly they have nothing to do with combat training which would assist our boys in preserving their own lives under combat conditions which seems to be the main plea of the advocates of this misnamed universal, which is not universal but highly selective, military, which is not military but essentially civilian, training.

So now we come to the question of whether the bill or the program outlined by the National Security Training Commission is training. It certainly is not universal. It certainly is not military. But perhaps it is training. Well, training requires a curriculum; it requires a teaching staff; and it requires the teaching facilities. The program is really five programs, one each under the control of the Army, the Navy, the Marines, the Air Force, and the Coast Guard. According to the statements of the chairman of the committee, no added personnel shall be used, no new facilities are to be built. Well, the Military Establishment is not composed of trained educators. It is supposed to be a military organization. I submit it is poor procedure to turn over to noneducators the job of setting up a curriculum and of providing the teaching staff, one for every two trainees—what a travesty; anyone with the minimum knowledge of education or training would treat this as so absurd as to properly draw the conclusion that anyone having anything to do with such a proposal knew nothing about education. Then, too, setting up the teaching facilities, the classrooms and laboratories is no small part of the art of teaching.

At one point it was said that this program was to be basic military training. But no one has troubled to define what

basic military training is. I believe that I know what it is. It is best expressed in the high-school ROTC program. As a matter of fact, if it is really basic military training that we are after the bill suggested by Congressman Brownson, on which I did some work, which seeks to extend the high-school ROTC program and put it on a universal basis will really do the job. Obviously the House Armed Services Committee is completely unfamiliar with the high-school ROTC and for that matter it would seem that they are unfamiliar with what basic military training is, if we can judge by the answer they give in their committee print on pertinent questions and answers with respect to H. R. 5904, see page 9, question 26. There the committee makes an observation that "the training that they would receive" would be in no way comparable to the type envisioned in a true UMT program. There is more to military training than learning how to fire a rifle, perform the manual of arms, and drill. I would like to ask here and now, as I asked last April, just what the Armed Services Committee or what any of the armed services think basic military training is. I tried to find out and had the Library of Congress do some research on the matter and I was amazed to find out that no one has any definition. I submit again that the best personnel preparation for defense is the program advanced in high-school ROTC. In continuing the question that I stopped, the Armed Services Committee goes on to say:

One of the biggest factors in this whole problem is the association with other men for a period of 6 months.

If this is the best that they have to offer as a reason for universal military training, I suggest that they start from scratch again.

No gentlemen, I think by any test we can properly state that the program presented to this Congress in H. R. 5904 based upon the National Security Training Commission's first report—and I hope the last—can hardly be called a training program. It is interesting to note that of the long list of witnesses who appeared before the Commission to testify—called by the Commission—only two could be said to be in the field of general education: Douglas Brown, dean of Princeton, and Dr. Leonard Carmichael, of the American Council of Education. No one appeared who was in the field of secondary education, in the field of trade-school training or industrial or institutional training. In fact, no one appeared who was a specialist in the field of training, which supposedly we are to give these boys of ours.

Even if more had appeared it would have availed this House little in our deliberations because as the Commission says in its report on the bottom of page 6:

They met with the Commission in private session and were promised that their views would be held in confidence.

And to date their views still seem to be in confidence. Well, just in passing I would like to know just what is so confidential about this subject or about these witnesses' testimony that would

not stand the light of day. Or better still, I would like to know how many, if any, and I repeat any, of these witnesses requested that their testimony be in confidence. What a shocking thing. This should be another object lesson to the Congress never again to forego its constitutional duty, its exclusive constitutional duty, to write legislation by transferring it to the executive branch of Government.

The amount of parliamentary chicanery the chairman of the Armed Services has indulged in since he first set his sights on slipping through this bill to turn over our 18-year-old boys to the Military Establishment is enough to set all Americans thinking. Ah, yes, I said, turn over to the Military Establishment. This National Security Training Commission did not make this study or write this bill. This bill was written and studied in the Pentagon. Anyone present to see the civilian commissioners testifying before the Armed Services Committee on this program would not long remain fooled. They were flanked at all times by high-ranking military officers who constantly prompted them with answers to the questions propounded.

Does anyone challenge that this is not the case? I am satisfied that James W. Wadsworth, chairman of this committee for whom I have great personal respect, but with whom I am in fundamental disagreement on not only this legislation but how it was prepared, will admit that this is the truth.

On April 3 and then later on April 12, 1951, I took the floor to urge the Armed Services Committee and the rest of the House to abide by the Constitution of the United States and write legislation concerning this important subject of military training in the Congress. I said then, we had plenty of time to do the job. I say today we still have plenty of time to do the job, if we really want to do it.

There is one point of agreement, and it is almost the only one, but it is basic, that I have with the chairman of the Armed Services Committee and that is, for the defense of this country we must have our citizens sufficiently trained so that with a small standing military establishment we can mobilize quickly, efficiently, and adequately to meet any national emergency, or if it be extreme, war. Only a basic formula like this will keep the freedoms we enjoy and at the same time keep a tremendous expense off the shoulders of our taxpayers.

Now to do this job we have to first get the glamour of military uniform out of our eyes and do a job analysis of the work our citizens must perform in time of war or great emergency. As I stated in my April speeches we have four basic categories of work activity. Neither is more nor less important than the other. All are necessary to win a war or keep a peace.

First. Those working in defense industries, including farming.

Second. Those working in civil service as employees of the Armed Forces.

Third. Those working as technicians under military law as part of the Armed Forces.

Fourth. Those engaged in combat work for the Armed Forces.

When we make this job analysis we immediately perceive certain basic things:

First. You can use almost all our citizens regardless of age, sex, or physical ability with only extreme exceptions somewhere in the picture.

Second. Only a certain portion need to be in military uniform or subject to military law.

The second step we must take, then, after doing a job analysis is to determine what physical requirements are necessary for the various tasks. Actually, only category IV—troops engaged in combat need to be completely physically fit. Yet in the past with our failure to do this job analysis and reasoning we have been requiring persons in category III to meet the same physical standards. Incidentally, the German military organization had, I believe, nine physical categories, with which to determine the job requirements, only one category of which was combat fitness.

The third step, and this is equally important, What group of these persons need to be in uniform in order to perform their tasks? This is to a certain extent defined by the Geneva Convention which affords a code of protection for persons in uniform captured by the enemy. Certainly it is true that our past theory and our present theory of putting stenographers, store clerks, mechanics, and so forth, in uniform is both unnecessary and costly.

To illustrate this point and perhaps in an unusual way, but I hope in an effective way, I suggest that the so-called failure of military law in World War II was not the failure of the law, which, indeed, had grown up through centuries of battle custom and usage, but rather the stupidity of extending military law to cover those who, though in uniform, were engaged in noncombat activities. Of course, battle law will not fit what is essentially civilian occupation, particularly if the civilians are Americans. But I suggest to you, however, the Congress in its wisdom has changed military law, the law that grew up through custom and usage will come into its own again on the front lines of any battlefield. You cannot repeal this law any more than you can repeal the law of gravity or whip the waves of the sea into submission as Xerxes once endeavored to do.

I dwell on these points, because before you talk about training men you must know the jobs for which you need the trained men.

Surely if the Military Establishment is ready to embark upon a training program they should have some idea of the number needed and the skills needed. And yet apparently they have none.

Let us consider one basic question. How many combat troops are needed, as opposed to those who are needed for technical skills? I have seen several estimates and I have my own based upon the estimates I have studied and my own experience. I have never seen an estimate by the Military Establishment. What is their estimate? My estimate is that 90 percent of the personnel in

uniform in World War II were engaged in activities noncombative and essentially civilian technical skills. In other words, only 10 percent of this Armed Force we hear talked about will ever be subjected to combat conditions and need to be trained in combat skills.

What is the number who need to be physically qualified for combat duty? What is the number that an Armed Force of three million under present military standards need trained in combat skills? Is there reason for secrecy about this? This is the figure that this Congress must know before it even begins to talk about universal military training. If it is only 300,000 men, then I suggest we have no real problem in getting combat troops. If we will place our medals and awards and flight pay and veteran benefits at their exclusive disposal the problem is easily answered through voluntary enlistment. And the Marines, that great fighting force, will tell you that a volunteer is worth five coerced men.

Let us get the facts. Then as to our radio operators, radio repairmen, truck drivers, cooks, aviation mechanics, stock clerks, pencil pushers, stenographers, photographers—yes, even the aerial photographer flying over enemy lines— aerologists, metal workers, budgetary, accounting, and disbursing personnel; statistical machine operators; vehicle mechanics; utility maintainers and operators; fabric, leather, and rubber maintenance men; transportation personnel; cooks and food-service personnel; supply personnel; administrative personnel; personnel for the personnel departments; medical attachés; security and law-enforcement personnel; fire-fighting personnel, and so forth, let our civilian schools—public, private, industrial, trade, and otherwise—along with our trade-unions and learning-on-the-job techniques, continue to train these people in their skills as they have before.

All we need do is what that great Secretary of Defense James Forrestal tried to do, set up a reserve force matching civilian skills already existent with skills that would be needed in time of war or emergency. If we are short some needed skills, it would be a great deal cheaper to ask that civilian enterprise, through proper incentives, to train such personnel.

Indeed, this was the success of the Seabees in World War II. If a man was fat and 40 and could run a bulldozer, Admiral Ben Moreell reasoned against Regular Establishment opposition he could be fat and 40 and run a bulldozer in the Seabees. He didn't need to come in as an apprentice seaman and go through boot camp. All he had to do was be given the rate commensurate with his skill and shake him down with his own unit for a month and send him off to do his job.

Now I am going to close by quoting the philosophy of those leaders in the Pentagon who want our 18-year-olds. They may be temporarily in power over in the Pentagon but I will wager their views are in the minority if we ever took the gag off so the others could talk. Here is their philosophy. It is the philosophy of any Federal bureau, even

though these particular bureaus may be in uniform. It is the philosophy of empire building. It is not the philosophy of patriotism we have a right to expect from a military establishment in a republic such as ours.

It was stated by General Hershey before the House Armed Services Committee last spring and may be found on page 195 of the hearings on the extension of the Draft Act and UMT:

I would say that in the Armed Forces and in the Navy, as I have observed them, no matter how much they talk about skill, what they want is a young, smart boy because they can teach him much easier than they can unteach many who come in with a lot of so-called skills but they generally have (a) a skill which is of doubtful value, unless modified, and (b) a desire to participate only with the skill they have. If there is anything else to be done, they want somebody else to do it. I believe that you just about got to build armies and build navies and build air forces by taking people who have capacity and teaching them what you want them to know, because unfortunately, by and large in our civilian life the type of man we need, and that is the fighter, is only there as an avocation and not as a vocation.

The real question before us is: Do you agree with General Hershey when he states that the military "can teach a young boy much easier than they can unteach many who come in with a lot of so-called skills but they generally have (a) a skill which is of doubtful value, unless modified, and (b) a desire to participate only with the skill they have."

I basically disagree with General Hershey. I further state that the miserable job done by the Armed Forces in matching civilian skills with the skills needed for the prosecution of World War II was one of the poorest jobs done in the entire war. Furthermore, this was a job that could have had considerable planning with little cost and yet the military establishment at the time of Pearl Harbor was almost completely unprepared to mobilize the civilian population to meet the needs of a major war.

From the way the present leaders in the military establishment have handled the reserve program to date, almost deliberately it seems, from the way certain high officers deliberately sabotaged the Reserve program advanced by James Forrestal. From the way they have sabotaged the National Guard; from the way the disgraceful training program at Lackland Airbase was conducted as brought out by a subcommittee of this House; from the way true unification of the Armed Forces has been sabotaged; from the way unification of supply and procurement, the common cataloging program has been delayed; from the way that policy directives from the high civilian authorities, including the Congress, have been evaded by high ranking military officers—it is no wonder that this country was caught as unprepared in Korea as we were in spite of vast expenditures.

I can say this, that no amount of money can cover up incompetence and disobedience. We are not concerned just with a poorly conceived program of personnel preparedness, here presented in this bill and in the Commission report,

we are confronted with a subtle revolt of the present leaders in the military establishment against civilian control. I suggest that this Congress administer the rebuke needed and recommit this preparedness question back to the Armed Services Committee for real study. And that study should include calling in as witnesses a few personnel and training experts who are not following the party line established by the present leaders in the Pentagon. I would hope, too, that the executive department of our Government might regard such Congressional action as a rebuke and shake the military establishment from stem to stern so that real military leaders instead of bureaucrats in uniform take charge and we can begin to get the defense which the dollars we are spending entitle us to.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, we have at last arrived at the sunset hour of the debate on this important issue. Before the smoke has settled on the horizon of debate and the words which have been said on this measure on this floor have sunk into forgetfulness and into the permanent archives of this Congress, I want future generations to know how one MENDEL RIVERS stood on this issue. I want it known now and in the future that I am for universal military training now regardless of what my political fortunes may be tomorrow or in any of the years to come. I want the Record to show where on this day, the last day of February 1952, I stood on this issue.

I would not be so vain as to think I had it within me to change any of you on this subject. I believe that as to most of us our minds are made up. I do not impugn your motives and I dare any of you to impugn mine.

Our committee has sat under the leadership of our great chairman for over 3 weeks, day and night, on this subject. We have taken the bill presented to us and carved it up and presented it to you as our own bill. We have written this bill, and no invisible hand any place has dictated our deliberations as we present to you what we conceive to be a program to preserve this country if there is still time.

I have heard all kinds of statements made on this floor about this bill. I would like any of you to point out to me where this staggering, indecisive, stupendous, costly, uneconomic draft system is getting us anywhere. Who of you in your districts do not when you go home discuss with the young men the indecision in their minds as they wait for this unfair Draft Act to come and tap them on the shoulder, while so many sections of our Nation find so many of their youth drafted by the selective service and other sections are not sharing impartially and equally?

I tried one time to find out what was being done under this draft system. I found out that at least one State in this Union had one city in its boundaries where about 62 percent of the boys were classified, while in my State of South Carolina the number of those not classi-

fied had diminished almost to the point of hardly being seen on the horizon, 97 percent of the boys being classified for the draft.

What is fair about that, I ask you. We have fashioned this bill for you to the best of our ability. We do not claim to be perfect, but we do claim that we have our share of perfection.

I want to call your attention to another thing. Under the leadership of our distinguished chairman, the Navy Department has a reserve system which has done pretty well by itself. When this Korean thing came about, had it not been for the reserve system of the Navy and its component departments, we would have been kicked off the Korean Peninsula. Remember you that. And I am willing to gamble with CARL VINSON for the future on what is good for the future of this country. You know, and I know, under his leadership, no Navy since civilization began can compare with the one that he has with his own hands and his vision and his indefatigable energy given to the American people. And if you with us will follow him in this fight, we will deliver to the unborn generations a nation that is secure.

Mr. Chairman, before I finish my statement on this matter I am going to read to you the prophetic words of a marine combat officer written in 1945, where he pointed to this day in the year 1952. There are those of you who will remember also in 1946 when Mr. VINSON sent a number of us to the Pacific to try to find out what was going on over there. The boys were hollering that they had the points and they wanted to be brought home. We went there and we saw the magic carpets bringing the boys home. The magic carpets, as you know, were the aircraft carriers. Even the aircraft carriers were utilized to bring the boys home. I saw on the islands of the Marianas 100 acres of equipment, which were left there. They came home much too early. But we heeded the pleas of the mothers and the fathers and sweethearts and the teachers and the preachers—the same voices that are telling us that we do not need this universal military training. If we are to depend upon the draft system for meeting our needs, God help America. God saved us in the past and God will save us in the future. We will not have the luxury of time and of space when Russia gets ready to strike. You who live in Boston, you who live in Chicago, you who live in Detroit, you who live in New York, you who live in Pittsburgh, you will be the first to feel the Russian's atomic blow when she is ready to attack you in the silence of the night. You will be the first to feel the guided missiles of the submarines that can get off the Atlantic seaboard and pierce your slumbering curtain. But as long as our Nation is prepared and as long as we have an adequate Reserve, and as long as we have a system which is decisive, which is unequivocal, and which lets the young men know what is expected of them, do not you believe that Russia will ever dare attack us. In my own State of South Carolina we have a \$2,000,000,000 H-bomb plant now under construction, hoping that down in that part of the

United States safe from bombs that will come out of the poles we can build a plant that will deliver us, if that horrible day of all-out atomic and hydrogen warfare should come.

I say to you the whole concept and tradition of this democratic Government is toward equality of opportunity. There is no equality of burden under the present system. The true principles of democracy require that there should be equality of burden in every respect. Why should there not be equality under the law, and equality of service, and equality of burden? I point out to you the unfairness of any system which permits the willing, the courageous, the conscientious, the volunteer to volunteer his services in the hazardous duties of wartime while the unwilling accept the benefits of military security and yet volunteer nothing in the hazards of our national defense. This concept will quickly lead to the liquidation of our courageous and brave people. In wartime no man should be required to make this decision, of whether to go or not to go, on his own responsibility. A voluntary decision to make a career of the Army is one thing, but a voluntary service in wartime to protect our country should be decided by an impartial authority. That impartial authority is you and it is me and it is the Congress.

I call to your attention that the courageous, determined Napoleonic wars in France volunteered. The courageous were liquidated. What has happened to France? They do not have enough people to kick the wrinkles out a prune. What few they have left are liquidated in French Indochina.

What happened to Britain? Their intelligent and courageous have been liquidated. What happened? The Attlee government led them down the road toward socialism.

I am not going to cast my vote to liquidate the courageous and those who are willing to fight while others stay home in a cloak of security, gained by the blood of those who were willing to defend our Nation.

What do you think of Wainwright and Deane, the indignities that they endured because we, this Congress and this Nation, have not followed a program of giving to our people a policy decisive; as I said, decisive and unequivocal.

I want to tell you some of the values that this bill will give you when it is properly implemented. It will give you a training plant. We will have not 20 percent combat training but we will have 60 percent combat training. We will have a pool of basically trained men who can catch up easier if the time should come.

It will release the Regular forces to meet important combat missions, to seize and hold ground of critical and strategic value, which otherwise might have to be taken or recovered at great sacrifice of life. By this we can preserve our allies, together with their industrial and combat values, rather than to go through the costly procedure of liberating them at different times when their industrial potentials are gone and their wealth carried off, God knows where.

I want to read to you what one boy wrote when he came back in 1945. His name is Jim Lucas. He is with Scripps-Howard. I will tell you who he was. He had eight battle stars, earned at Guadalcanal, New Georgia, Russell Islands, Tarawa, Apamama, Saipan, Tinian, and Iwo Jima. I think he had a right to speak. Listen to what he was telling you and me in 1945, when we embarked on the road of indifference—indifference, and we have arrived at this point now where we are trying to buy our security:

Little people like to believe they don't make wars.

Dictators make wars. Kings make wars. Even Presidents and Congresses make wars. But not the common man. He merely fights them. And when war comes, he likes to believe he has been betrayed.

After 3 years in the Pacific, some of us reject that as rank escapism. We think you little people had a hand in making the war we just finished. We fear you may be making another.

General Marshall says we must have universal military training. So does Admiral King. So do General Vandegrift, General Eisenhower, General MacArthur. We've served under those men in a global war. We think they are competent to speak. We've followed them into battle on two continents and they haven't let us down. Moreover, we've seen, out there in the Pacific, what happened to our inadequate pre-Pearl Harbor forces at Guam, Wake, Manila, Pearl Harbor.

It's not that we like military life. Most of us don't. We've been scared, uncomfortable, unhappy, lonesome. We've wanted to come home. But—and this is important—we've always taken it for granted someone would take our place.

It comes as a shock that a segment of the public, mothers, preachers, educators—are campaigning noisily against universal training. We can't believe they know more about it than our leaders.

We aren't professional soldiers. We are civilians again, and happy to be. But we know we can maintain peace only by remaining strong. Strip our forces and we lose everything we've gained. We think we bought peace at too fearful a price for that.

Many ex-soldiers, ex-sailors, ex-Marines are frankly worried. We say something like this:

"You're doing it to us again. You're going to strip us of our basic weapons, our manpower. Then you'll begin taking away our guns and our ships. In a few years, you'll stick us, our kid brother or our sons, on an island with a beanshooter and a prayer. You haven't learned yet."

We are surprised to hear it seriously argued that we've always been able to train an army after we are attacked and, by golly, we can start flat-footed and whip 'em again. I'd be careful with that one. I wouldn't, for instance, recommend telling it to the boys who were on Wake or Bataan. We can't seriously believe that an aggressor nation is going to give us a third chance. We've played on luck too long.

The case for mother is stronger than for preacher or teacher. Mother thinks with her heart. She prefers to believe peace can be kept in some mysterious fashion; after all, she shouldn't be expected to know how, without her boy leaving home. But mother, bless her heart, is something less than a good American when she insists that her boy come home, even if he doesn't have enough points, or bullies the Government into scuttling the point system. That's not idle talk. Congressmen say that the bulk of their mail does not attack demobilization as a policy. Ninety percent of it, one

Congressman estimates, is a plea for special privilege for specific individuals.

Teacher should think with his mind. But isn't he thinking in terms of fees and enrollments? The preacher talks doctrine. Their outcry against military training is the more damning. We don't think it can be justified.

Mother, teacher, preacher occupy unique positions in our national life. This is particularly true of mother. Other peoples told us that no nation on earth, certainly no bunch of fighting men, is more closely tied to the apron strings than we are.

You are the vocal voters. You are spokesmen for "the little people" who make wars and innocently disclaim all responsibility for them. You hold great power in our Government. You cannot escape responsibility the next time, if again you make war by tearing down our defenses and inviting another attack.

We don't doubt that you can frighten Congress into rejecting the considered opinions of the men who led us to victory. Congress scares easily.

O. K., mother. O. K., professor. O. K., parson. But are you willing to take the consequences if you lead us into world war III?

So said Jim Lucas in 1945. Are we following that road today? Is the tendency down that road? In time of danger he who travels the same road twice ought to have his head examined. For me there is no education in the second kick of a mule. For me, I choose this course regardless of consequences. Unborn generations can well say: "RIVERS tried to give us a chance."

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, the Members of this Congress who are being called upon to vote for or against universal military conscription, I am sure, are faced with the most momentous decision they have been called upon to make, at least during the almost 10 years of my service in this body.

It is one that must cause us to search our souls and conscience in the hope of making the right decision. I deem this problem so important that it compels us to disregard any thought of whether it may please any one group of the American people because, in fact, it will affect equally all groups of people whether they be members of patriotic organizations, farm groups, church groups, educators, laboring groups, or minority groups of any kind.

After making a study of this legislation and hearing the arguments of those who favor it, and of those who oppose it, after reviewing the effects of universal military training or conscription upon other nations throughout world history, and after considering the accomplishments of our Nation and other free nations who were our allies who have never adopted universal military conscription, but who won World War I and World War II with free men defeating all other nations which had builded their strength on universal military conscription, and after taking a great many other factors

into consideration, I am compelled in good conscience to oppose this legislation.

It was an American statesman and philosopher in the founding days of our Republic who wisely said, in substance, "that in guiding the future of our country we should consider the experience of the past." Let us take a look at the past.

I should like to point out that history records all governments throughout the hundreds of years which adopted military conscription beginning with Rome, Greece, France under Napoleon, Germany under Bismarck, Kaiser Wilhelm, Hitler, and again Rome under Mussolini, have been defeated and practically destroyed by nations which did not have universal military conscription but by nations who kept their people free from military dictatorship.

Why adopt the age-old policies of universal military conscription that would oppress and limit the freedom of our young men, when history records their failure in every instance?

In World War I it was largely through the efforts of the United States, Canada, and the British Empire, not one of which had conscription, which brought defeat to the German Empire under Kaiser Wilhelm.

Then again, in World War II the free nations with free men bearing arms, backed by the industrial might of free nations, namely the United States, Canada, England, Australia, came into the fight and won World War II destroying the military conscription machines of Hitler, Mussolini of Italy, and Japan.

Russia, a Communist state with universal military conscription was the only nation left and Russia must continue to keep the people under conscription, regimentation, and control in order to keep them in slavery.

Now the administration and the military leaders of our country who hold high office by the appointment of the President, are demanding that the Congress pass universal military training or conscription which will give them the power to control the lives of every able-bodied man in our country from 18 years to his twenty-sixth birthday.

They would take him from his home environment at the age of 18 years and give him elementary military training for 6 months. Then he would be put into the Reserve for 7½ years until 26 years of age, subject to call into military training or service during any of the 7½ years. At the very age and time he would like to plan his future, he cannot do so. He is under bondage to his Government and subject to its call. Can you imagine his confusion and discouragement?

This, notwithstanding the fact that we now have a draft law which runs to 1955 through which all of the young men the military and the Government think they need, are being drafted into the military through selective service. We now have in the military service approximately 3,500,000 men.

I am opposed to this legislation because I think it would weaken the defense of our country, rather than strengthen it. Let us assume that 800,000 young men during the year 1953, 18 years

of age, would be called up under the universal military training bill for 6 months' military training. Can you imagine the billions of dollars it will cost to provide housing, medical care, transportation, salaries, Government insurance, and so forth. And when these 800,000 men have had their 6 months' training they will be held in the Reserve for 7½ years and doubtless the great majority of them will have no more training because there will not be sufficient armories, or places where they can meet and train.

Now suppose we get into a war 2 years, 3 years, 4 years, 5 years later. Anyone must know with the constant change of weapons and warfare due to science and research that the cost of training, and the loss of their time in such training would be of practically no value to them, because if they were called into war they would all have to be retained.

That would financially weaken the defense of our country because of the cost of training them, because of the loss of their labor on the farms and in the factories when they were in training, the cost of the equipment when training them, which would then be obsolete, and in addition to that to train these 800,000 men you would have to take out of the Army now from Korea or elsewhere from the military over 300,000 officers who would train these men as it will take about one officer to every three trainees.

Let us assume for the next 5 years that we train 800,000 boys coming 18 years of age each year for 6 months and hold them in the Reserve. Can anyone begin to figure the cost of such a continuing financial load? They will get little training other than the 6 months even though they are held in the Reserve for 7½ years. What a waste of manpower and what a waste of money.

That is not the worst feature of the problem. It will take the young men away from the farms, from their basketball teams, their sports in the little towns and cities throughout the Nation, away from the influence of the home, church, and civic environment. It will take him to Army camps where he is only a number among countless thousands. His instructors will be military instructors and his education will be along military lines, and his thinking will be fashioned to a great extent at this age to the military viewpoint. He will become accustomed to having his freedom and liberty limited. He will be weaned away to a certain extent from the freedom he enjoyed in his home and in the classroom. His thinking will be circumscribed and limited possibly for the rest of his life in most instances.

He could argue his viewpoint with his teachers in high school, with his parents at home, and with anyone; he cannot talk back or argue his views in the Army. He will take orders or else.

Mr. Chairman, Members of Congress time and again have tried to work out a better program with the military at very little cost compared with this program coordinated with the schools of the Nation. Such a program could and should be coordinated with our economic, educational, religious, and social way of

life. But the military has always turned a deaf ear to such a proposal.

The military apparently wants to indoctrinate the young men of the future; they want to plan their education; they want to carry on every conceivable kind of a school and they have been doing that. If and when they get this universal military training fastened upon the young men of this Nation they will have the power to, and will tell the young men what schools they can enter, what courses they shall study, in the Reserve program, who can be doctors and dentists, who can study to be scientists, and who shall be cooks, garbage collectors, or what have you.

A program of coordinating military training is now in effect in some universities, colleges, and schools and has already proven the wisdom and value of such a plan, but the military does not want it.

There are 670 educational institutions in America now training Reserves. I understand there are approximately 160 applications from other schools now before those in the Pentagon that are anxious to train and could have been training Reserves for nothing except the United States Government furnish the equipment. In that group of 670 schools there were 328,480 students as of 1950 in the Reserves. There are a greater number now in training.

ADMINISTRATION AND MILITARY WANT MORE POWER

The President and his military appointees are asking for more and more power in this legislation that many believe is dangerous to the people of America. For years the people have been complaining that the Congress has surrendered too much of its power to the executive department. They are demanding that the Congress take back some of these powers; they are complaining, and I think justly so, that the military and the State Department, under the administration, now have too much power.

The people are fearful that the granting of more such powers will cause our country to be dominated, directed, and controlled by the military.

SOME PROVISIONS OF THIS BILL

First. The bill gives the President power to keep the inductee in active training for the entire 8 years whether or not a state of war exists, depending on the President's wishes.

Second. The wording is not clear, so that it may apply to women as well as men.

Third. Without check, it gives the President and Congress autocratic power to select and induct for training such number of persons as may be required, whether or not a state of war exists.

Fourth. The President has complete authority to make deferments from training and service for anyone engaged in study, research, or other endeavors necessary to the maintenance of health, safety, or interest.

Fifth. It will increase the cost of Government and this bill recommends one instructor for every three trainees.

Sixth. It could establish a total military dictatorship in the United States.

Seventh. Unless the trainees are kept in continuous service, they would not be ready for combat duty, refuting the well-trained-reserve argument of UMT.

Eighth. With whose ideals and concepts of ethics, and by what means will the trainees be indoctrinated?

We had better open our eyes before we take this long and fateful step.

WE MUST PROTECT OUR FINANCIAL AND ECONOMIC POWER

We now have a military force of about 3,500,000 men. The Selective Service now has the power to draft every able-bodied young man from 18½ to 26 years of age. This gives them the power to build up the necessary reserve strength through selective service through which men are thoroughly trained in the military. Under the UMT bill, practically all men trained would have to be retrained if and when called through Selective Service. Their training under UMT would be practically worthless and would unnecessarily further drain off the manpower of our Nation which should be allowed to remain on the farms, in industry, and other pursuits to strengthen the economy of our Nation.

Past experience has proved that when Congress declared war there was plenty of time to give basic military training to inductees who, in every instance, in the past have been called into the service faster than military equipment can be produced with which to train them.

The power of our industrial might and our financial stability back of the lines on the home front made it possible for us to win World War I and World War II. We must increase this power and our financial strength to win world war III if it comes.

To keep our economy strong we must not through universal military training further drain off the young manpower of our country, slow down agriculture, scientific research, our industrial power, and weaken the financial solvency of our Nation.

Under Selective Service we have already greatly depleted our manpower on the farms. The universal military training bill will take more men from these farms. We should remember the part an abundance of food production plays in the winning of any long drawn out war. We may endanger the food supply of this Nation. In the same manner this universal military training bill would take more men out of industry slowing down the industrial power of our Nation which is absolutely necessary for the ultimate winning of any war that may come.

Our greatest contribution to the defense of our country and our allies, if war comes, lies in our ability to aid them with our air and naval power. To be in position to do this we need to rapidly build up our Air Force, to increase our production of tanks, guns, rockets, ammunitions of war generally. In such manner we can make our greatest contribution if a global war comes.

It would be unwise for us to try to match our manpower in numbers and spread them all over the world because we are so tremendously outnumbered by

the hordes of people in Asia and Eastern Europe.

We should continue to build up the industrial, economic, agricultural and scientific powers of our Nation through which we shall make our greatest contribution.

I think it is unfortunate that this bill has come before the House which has rocked and disturbed the thinking of the American people from coast to coast. It is unfortunate because in these critical times we need unity among our people as never before.

I have given only a few of the reasons why I think this legislation should not be enacted. I repeat it will unnecessarily limit the freedom of the young men of our country who are taken into the military service and I sincerely believe that it will greatly weaken the defense of our country rather than to give it greater strength.

In conclusion let me say the basic, immutable, fundamental reservoirs from which this Nation has drawn its strength and power since the founding of our Constitution have been in preserving the greatest individual freedom and opportunity for each of its citizens from the Christian environment of the homes of the Nation, and from the cultural and spiritual environment of our churches, schools, and educational institutions. I am opposed to this legislation because I believe it weakens the opportunity for these fundamental principles to make their greatest contribution to the youth of our land when they are taken away from such environment as the passage of this legislation would do.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 9 minutes.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I am in disagreement with the gentleman who preceded me. However, I know that all of the House is in agreement that our purpose is to make and keep America strong. The question to be voted upon is whether or not the proposed legislation accomplishes that purpose.

If the United States is threatened by an enemy, the security of the United States demands that two questions be answered. We must determine how we shall muster our men and matériel, and then, how shall they be deployed. If this Congress cannot be certain as to the intentions of our President in the deployment of our forces and in international meddling, then we are talking in riddles. If our administration is seeking to give freedom, as we know it, to over a billion people of the world who do not have our tradition, who are hostile to our way of life, who would not retain liberty as we know it if we gave it to them, then we are powerless. No law could be drafted by this Congress by which we could muster enough men and matériel from 150,000,000 people to police the world.

If we assume that in the future our State Department and our President will make sound and proper decisions in for-

eign policy, the time spent on debate of this bill is justified. However, if we believe that the foreign policy of our President is designed to give us a war economy to bolster a planned but collapsing peacetime economy, the time now being spent is not justified. If we are risking the security of this country beyond the capacity of its men and matériel in foreign fields through the exercise of powers usurped from this Congress, our first order of business should be the recapture of those powers and the impeachment of those illegally exercising power.

During the debate on this bill, I arranged the affairs of my office so that I might listen to every possible minute of the argument. The object of the bill is declared to be the establishment of a peacetime Reserve. Yet the proponents of the bill admit that it does not accomplish that purpose. We know that France not only slept behind a Maginot line, but it also slept behind an untrained reserve in which it had confidence. If we are agreed that we need a trained Reserve, then an untrained Reserve is of no value no matter what its cost.

This bill has taken on the characteristics of other administration proposals. The proponents do not want to discuss actual cost nor probable cost. They make reference to trivial sums of money. Yet, we know that America now has about 75,000,000 males. It is admitted that it would cost about \$3,000 to train one youth for 6 months. It is admitted that our Reserves now cost us about \$424 per year per man. If we are to assume that the program is what it purports to be and is universal, we know that when we have a new group of males in America numbering 75,000,000 we will have spent \$225,000,000,000 to give them each 6 months' training, and we will have spent the additional sum of \$244,000,000,000 for the time that they are in the Reserve; that is for the 7½-year period. This sum totals \$469,000,000,000. This represents a figure of about \$7,000 for each of those male citizens. It represents the cost of an average home. It is not to be paid for by this Government but it is to be collected from those citizens. In the first 156 years of our United States history, all of our Presidents collected only \$248,000,000,000. This included two world wars. During the first 6 years under our present Executive, we have collected \$260,000,000,000 in taxes, and by the end of this year he will have collected \$320,000,000,000. I submit the proponents of this legislation should answer the question: Why should this Congress commit future generations to an estimated tax cost of \$938,000,000,000 in 150 years, when all of our wars including two world wars and all of our other costs of government only total \$248,000,000,000 in 156 years of our history. The proponents speaking for this administration bill, do not answer the question. They speak in generalities. They admit it does not accomplish our purpose and then demand its passage.

My colleague from California, in the course of his remarks, stated that he would support this proposed legislation because he saw no opportunity for peace in the near future. I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that America will never know

peace so long as our Chief Executive exercises the usurped power of this Congress to declare war and thus bolster a planned inflation at home with a war emergency economy abroad during election years.

I at one time thought favorably of universal military training. I am still of the opinion that beneficial military training and experience could be given to all of our young men through an expansion of the program now provided by our National Guard. This would require amendment of title 32 of the United States Code. This would require complete control of the manpower of our country at the State level until Congress declared war. Surely, there is no doubt in any one's mind who has heard the argument but what all of the training planned to be given to our young men under the proposed legislation could just as effectively and far more economically be given through the National Guard. Provision could there be made for the annual training of the reserves. Yet, the proposed legislation sent to us by the Pentagon does not permit discussion of this subject. The committee has not considered the alternative and the bill before us actually vests the power in the Pentagon to destroy the National Guard during peacetime.

Surely, each of the 435 Members of this House must wonder why the Congress is asked to pass this legislation for the only expressed reason that it is unreasonable and will not accomplish our purpose. We must wonder what forces are back of this measure. I have been in unusually close attendance on the debate because I have hoped that I might find some reason to soften my opinions as expressed on April 3 of last year in the well of this House. I have looked in vain and I respectfully request that the membership of this House read those remarks and their documentation before voting on the passage of this legislation. I believed then and I believe now, that there are those in our Military Establishment seeking to give America military socialism. I believed then and I believe now, that the security of America demanded an immediate cleaning out of the Pentagon by those who understood the Military Establishment and believed in the American way of life.

In the few minutes remaining to me, I want to recall certain facts to the attention of the House. While the proposed legislation gives 18-year-old boys the protection of a civilian court for his 6 months' period of training, he is subject in peacetime to military court martial if he violates an order of the Executive while he is in the military Reserve. Our Constitution provides that the Congress, and only the Congress, can declare war. It also provides that even after Congress declares war the President cannot raise armies. The provision in this regard is that only Congress can raise armies. Even then, there is the added precaution that Congress itself cannot finance an Army for longer than 2 years. It is understandable that our President was made Commander in Chief of our armies. However, many of our States would not have ratified our Constitution if the additional precaution

were not included that during peacetime our President would have no command over the Militia. Until this Congress declares war, the Militia of the respective States are under the command of the Governors of those States. It is true that our President in peacetime does have command of forces limited by this Congress. However, our Constitution wisely provided against centralized military control of our manpower during peacetime. This Congress has heretofore passed the National Guard Act and it has delegated its responsibility to determine emergencies sufficient to call up the National Guard to the President. He still has that power.

The proposed legislation will now destroy the protective provision of our Constitution which prohibits the President from having command of the Militia of America during peacetime. At great and unjustifiable cost, the President now asks us to pass this legislation which under the guise of giving our youths 6 months' military training will place them in the military Reserve of America subject to the military orders of the Executive. When and if this legislation is passed, he will also have the delegated power of this Congress to declare war and emergencies. When he exercises that delegated power, he will then have military command of all of the able-bodied males in America as a result of his universal proposal here under consideration to force all men into that command. Mr. Speaker, to ever repeal this legislation or to amend it will require a two-thirds vote over the veto of any future Executive. Casual conversation with other Members of this House indicates a lack of knowledge of why the framers of our Constitution insisted upon the provisions I have just referred to. The framers of our Constitution were well aware that the first Bill of Rights was won in England in 1689. Kings and Parliaments had raised armies and the peoples suffered. Until 1879 the British people were protected by the Mutiny Act. It was passed each year by the Parliament and always recited that the Bill of Rights made it illegal to maintain a standing army except with the consent of Parliament. Even then, Parliament had to make an express finding that a certain number of armed men were needed, and it had to make an appropriation of money. In 1879, the title of the Mutiny Act was changed to the Army Discipline and Regulation Act. Even then though, it was passed each year. I believe it is now known as the Army Annual Act. Civil war resulted in England when Charles I raised his own money to build a powerful navy. He was beheaded by the Parliamentary Party. England had gone through several hundred years of the development of the common law when it had the above referred to experience. Yet, there are those in our midst in this House who believe we cannot profit by that experience. They believe that experience was peculiar to England. They believe our checks and balances will save us. Yet, the practical effect of what they do here by this proposed legislation is to destroy the power of this Congress to check our Executive and we propose to pass the bill when we

admit that it will not accomplish our desired purpose.

The profound students who drafted our Constitution knew that there was a serious weakness in our form of government when no provision was made for allegiance to a king, and our Constitution was made in writing. Our people owe allegiance to the meaning of a written Constitution. If its meaning is changed through incompetence or demagogues, the change is permanent, until 150,000,000 people are induced to make formal changes as provided in the Constitution. We now have two men on our Supreme Court bench who have said publicly that in constitutional matters they are free to redefine words and phrases in our Constitution. They can amend our Constitution by such redefinition. We have a legislature composed of two Houses of equal strength. They have equal strength in the passage of legislation and its repeal or amendment. If one of those Houses comes under the domination of a particular class or group during a period of economic change, such repeal or amendment may be impossible. If its repeal or amendment is necessary against the wishes of an empowered Executive where a two-thirds vote is required such action by the Congress would be virtually impossible. The legislation before us is offered by our Executive seeking more and additional powers. The report itself admits that it is not the result of a complete and final study. The proposed legislation carries with it the implied power of applying military law to picket lines and regulating the press and our whole economy, if our Chief Executive believes that is necessary in the national interest.

Mr. Chairman, wherever the vile furies of socialism have been accepted by free governments under the guise of transferring the responsibilities of free Christian family life to the soulless business of government, we have always found corruption in government and a miserable standard of living as the result. The new Queen of England still has the power to dismiss a Parliament dominated by one house and tell her people that her previous governments have not been complying with the unwritten constitution of England. She presumably will do that when her people are ready to support her at the end of their foolish experiment in socialism. Her people owe allegiance to their Queen. I put the very sincere question, however, What is left but civil war for the United States when the meaning of its written Constitution is changed through chicanery and redefinition in order to keep demagogues in public office? What are 150,000,000 people to do when the custodian of their allegiance no longer tolerates or speaks for individual freedom and competitive free enterprise, and they are hounded to death by carpetbaggers peddling regimentation and government by executive decree? I direct your attention to the fifth amendment of our Constitution, where our grand juries are made a bulwark against criminal prosecution except in the land and naval forces or in the militia, where the person to be charged is in the service in a time

of war or public danger. I remind you again that we have heretofore delegated to the President the power to determine when national emergencies exist. The proposed legislation now before us will give our President the power of military justice over all men past the age of 18 years and 6 months. Where can 150,000,000 people look for relief when they are deprived of the sixth amendment and their speedy trial, right to be confronted with witnesses, trial in a local court, and a counsel if necessary to present his defense. Where will they look for an allegiance to bring back trial by jury and their right to bear arms as guaranteed to them in the second amendment. Will they be able to look to their sovereign 48 States for relief?

Can anyone answer the question, What does the word "sovereignty" mean in connection with our 48 States, if we centralize in Washington complete control of our able-bodied men and give Washington the power to destroy the National Guard in peacetime? All of us come from States whose constitutions have provisions in regard to the militia. I want to read you article 8, sections 1 and 2, of the California Constitution:

LEGISLATURE TO PROVIDE FOR MILITIA

SECTION 1. The legislature shall provide, by law, for organizing and disciplining the militia, in such manner as it may deem expedient, not incompatible with the Constitution and laws of the United States. Officers of the militia shall be elected or appointed in such manner as the legislature shall from time to time direct, and shall be commissioned by the governor. The governor shall have power to call for the militia to execute the laws of the State, to suppress insurrections, and repel invasions. (Constitution of 1849, art. VIII, secs. 1, 2, 3, revised 1879.)

MILITIA TO CARRY ONLY NATIONAL OR STATE FLAG

SEC. 2. All military organizations provided for by this constitution, or any law of this State, and receiving State support, shall, while under arms either for ceremony or duty, carry no device, banner, or flag of any state or nation, except that of the United States or the State of California.

If we pass the proposed legislation, where will our governors find their State police force to execute the laws of the State, to suppress insurrections and to repel invasions, which responsibilities and powers are placed on those governors under the Federal Constitution?

If we pass the proposed legislation and vest in our Executive all of the powers withheld from him by the wise framers of our Constitution, the only power this Congress will retain to control his action will be the right to refuse to finance armies that our Executive has put into the field. The last 18 months demonstrate that you will not take that action. He has usurped the power to declare war and has exercised it for 18 months. Yet the Congress has regimented the Nation without debate in connection with impeachment of the President because we all want to give every support to those who are dying in an undeclared war. I say to you that this Congress will never refuse to finance our sons in foreign fields who are dying in compliance with an unconstitutional order of their Commander in Chief.

Mr. Chairman, this Congress and all its membership have a grave responsibility they should seek to perform to their very death. That responsibility is the defense of and the proper exercise of the constitutional responsibilities placed upon us in that document which creates the American way of life.

The time that has elapsed since 13 States ratified our Constitution is but a moment compared to recorded history. Alexander Hamilton was a great student of government and history. When the State conventions were debating ratification, Alexander Hamilton said in the *Federalist*, and I quote:

The Legislature of the United States will be obliged by this provision, once at least every 2 years, to deliberate upon the propriety of keeping a military force on foot; to come to a new resolution on the point; and to declare their sense of the matter by a formal vote in the face of their constituents. They are not at liberty to vest in the executive department permanent funds for the support of an army, if they were even incautious enough to be willing to repose in it so improper a confidence.

Mr. Hamilton was referring to that provision for congressional power in our Constitution which reads as follows:

To raise and support armies, that no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years.

Twenty years ago, one of our greatest statesmen was Chief of Staff. He was Gen. Douglas MacArthur, and in his typically frank manner he reported to the Congress that there were those in the Military Establishment seeking to exercise illegal powers. He even pointed out, as the proponents here admit in regard to the proposed legislation, that they sought powers without a purpose. The January 1952 issue of the *American Legion* magazine carried an article by General MacArthur entitled "The Citizen." I want to read you two paragraphs from page 15 of the magazine:

Now our military policy again requires revision. Under selective service and other statutes, we have called up large increments of our citizen soldiery with which to prosecute the Korean war and to bolster our own defense and the defense of many other lands. We have adopted the principle of universal military training, and the outlook is toward maintaining for many years—even in peace—an armed readiness for war.

All this, while intended and designed to strengthen freedom's defense, carries within itself the very germs to freedom's destruction. For it etches the pattern to a military state which, historically under the control of professional military thinking in constant search for means toward efficiency, has found in freedom possibly its greatest single impediment, to brush it aside as inimicable to established military policy. To avoid this historic pitfall, it is essential that civilian control over the citizen army be extended and intensified. Particularly is this true in the administration of the program of universal military training, if the youth of our land is to avoid being corrupted into a legion of subservience to the so-called military mind.

Mr. Chairman, it is generally believed that one Congress cannot bind its successor or other Congresses elected by the people of our country. Yet, the passage of this bill will transfer such powers to the President which by their very nature

will make it virtually impossible for future Congresses to effectively exercise their obligation to declare war, to raise armies, to finance armies, and to guarantee to the individual States a republican form of government. I am not prepared to take that action.

THE PROPOSED UMT PROGRAM

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, the universal military training proposal submitted to Congress would place all young men 18 years of age into Army camps scattered all over the country for 6 months of basic training. Then each of them would continue serving in a Reserve component of our military forces for an additional 7½ years. This is a permanent peacetime military-conscription program.

THE LOCAL TRAINING PLAN

I will support a universal military training program that will provide military training of young men within the vicinity of their homes. This training could be carried on as a part of our school program or in military districts so established as not to remove these boys of a tender age from the environment and protection of their homes.

I cannot vote for a universal military training program which would take every high-school boy from the protection, guidance, and environment of his parents, church, and school, and place him in Army camps far removed from his locality.

For every two trainees brought to these Army camps there would be one military instructor, with whom these teen-agers would be constantly associated. Combat service for well-qualified and properly trained young men is not nearly so destructive as their living the Army life among older, carefree military instructors. I was in the Army long enough to know that the fast-living and irresponsible environment, which is encouraged and considered by most military officers as essential to the orientation of men for future combat, is certainly not a character-building program for our young boys.

REGIMENTATION OF OUR YOUTH

The universal military training program submitted to Congress would regiment every young man from his eighteenth through his twenty-sixth birthday, with no freedom for engagements and undertakings as has been our American heritage. No longer would the teen-agers be counting the days until they would become high-school graduates, but, instead, they would be counting the days until they would become a part of the national goose-stepping military machine.

MILITARIZATION

It is argued that we must adopt this type of universal military training because this is the system used by communistic Russia. That we must fight fire with fire. It could just as well be argued that we need to adopt communism in our efforts to combat communism.

History reveals that peacetime military conscription has led to the downfall of every major nation that has

adopted it since the days of the Roman Empire. History further reveals that the people of every major nation who have adopted peacetime military conscription have lost complete control of their governments—Germany, Italy, and Japan are good recent examples.

The proponents of peacetime conscription cite Sweden, a country with no more people than the city of Chicago, and Switzerland, a country with no more people than the city of New York, as the only exceptions to military destruction by virtue of peacetime universal military training. It would not be argued that either one or both of these small nations could be overrun in a day by any major aggressor. Military efforts of those small countries do not make a lot of difference, and, certainly, their operations are no criterion for the United States of America, a country with more than 150,000,000 freedom-loving people, and the greatest power on earth. Russia's World War II forces were assembled by this same system. They lost millions of men and would have been completely annihilated but for the resources afforded them by free people.

Those insisting upon this foreign proposal suggest that we have 18,000,000 living veterans in the United States who were not militarized during their military services. They seem to forget that those 18,000,000 men were serving their country for a limited time during an emergency, and that every one of them was living for the day when he could leave the military service and return to his American freedom. The adoption of such military regimentation of our youth will lead to a military control of our Government.

Our free people entered World Wars I and II facing adversary countries of regimented people who had been preparing for decades under goose-step military doctrines and socialistic philosophies to take over rulership of the world. The correlated production and military efforts of our free people were sufficient to overnight surpass the concerted preparations of those regimented peoples who who knew nothing but public ownership, military dictatorship, and government domination. Certainly we should not replace our proven democratic principles and American heritage with a system which has brought destruction to every other nation who has adopted it.

AN EFFECTIVE RESERVE SYSTEM

Were the military geniuses of the Pentagon Building not purposely imposing upon and mistreating the veterans of the Reserves, and were they not intentionally refusing to use the draft system as a means of replacing veterans of World War II, as a despicable means of forcing peacetime military conscription upon our people, there would be some merit to the argument that this proposed program would prevent a recurrence of the situation which has resulted in a majority of the 800 reservists being called into the Korean conflict who were veterans of World War II. Those dictatorial military master minds have intentionally sabotaged the voluntary Reserve components of this country and

have refused to use the draft system for the sole purpose of destroying our American way of life.

No one person, not even the so-called military experts, will contend that this type of universal military training can become effective until after the present emergency. However, they insist upon its adoption during this emergency at a time when they can scare the people into believing it necessary because of the emergency, for the simple reason they well know that our people would never swallow such a bitter pill at a time when they were not all jittery with war nerves. Surely we have not drifted into that status whereby we need forget that this is a peace-loving nation, and that we need call upon the military forces of the Pentagon Building to operate the internal affairs of this country as a Gestapo.

Of course, it will be difficult to obtain voluntary reservists after the veterans of those components have been so discriminated against during the Korean war. Of course, the draft system is not furnishing enough replacements in Korea for World War II veterans for the simple reason that the draft system is not being properly used. Those intentional inequities and malicious derelictions could be immediately corrected by this Congress without the enactment of legislation foreign to our proven democratic principles. The military leaders have long ago been afforded plenty of time to replace World War II veterans in Korea by virtue of the draft system had they not been more interested in militarizing every child of this country. There were over 2,500,000 men left in the various Reserve components in January of last year, 6 months after the start of the Korean war. We have some of the greatest military leaders in the world, but they are not among those who are more interested in abolishing democracy than providing a strong military defense.

MERITORIOUS LEGISLATION NEEDS NO SUGAR-COATING

Knowing that our people have become very sensitive to excessive governmental expenditures, it was first contended by the proponents of this legislation in a loud, boastful, and challenging voice, led by the Chairman of the Congressional Armed Services Committee, that the enactment of this legislation would reduce the cost of our Armed Forces. As debate progressed on the floor of Congress and all concerned became aware of the true provisions of the legislation, and the basis for the money-saving argument, the proponents began ducking their former contentions that the program would reduce expenditures. Even though the Armed Services Committee chairman had challenged the world to refute his figures that the universal military training program would save our Government \$13,000,000,000; when it became time to meet the challenge upon the floor of Congress, he refused to submit himself to questioning on this point. Various Armed Services Committee proponents have generally admitted in debate that there was little, if any, basis for the money-saving contention. There was never such a great effort put forth

to mislead the people upon any issue before this Congress. Not even the committee chairman will now contend that a savings can be expected until there can be a reduction of the standing Armed Forces; and he admits that there can be no reduction until we are assured of peace and tranquillity. This is a peacetime military conscription bill that will cost additional billions to put into any type of operation.

There have been so many misleading figures used in an effort to sugar-coat the cost that it would be impossible to cover all of them in any reasonable time. In an effort to fool the people the proponents have contended that a reservist can be actively trained for 6 months \$500 cheaper than training a draftee for the same length of time, while at the same time admit that for every two trainees there will be required one military instructor. Such a conclusion could only be reached by charging the universal military trainee equipment, instruction cost, and so forth, to the Armed Forces—just paper work at no savings. These military instructors would necessarily need to come from the Armed Forces. I do not know how the Armed Forces could spare this great number of instructors if we actually need the 3,700,000 men in our standing force. Now, this would be no few instructors, because there are an average of 3,330 boys becoming 18 years of age daily. Approximately 800,000 young men would be trained annually—4,000,000 trainees and 2,000,000 instructors in 5 years' time. Talk about saving money, this would add billions of dollars to our already staggering expenditures.

Remember, the military experts insist that the standing Armed Forces will not be reduced until we are at complete peace with the rest of the world. They admit that even during peacetime our present standing forces of 3,700,000 men should not be reduced below approximately 2,000,000 men, and that we should have at least three or four reserves for each man released from active duty. Following the figures advanced by the proponents of this legislation, the training and personnel cost to the Government of one active military man over a period of 8 years is \$2,369, and the cost to the Government of one ready reserve for the same length of time is \$744. Of course, there is no basis for this exaggerated difference in cost, but they are the figures of the proponents. Three ready reservists at a cost of \$744 per man per year amounts to \$2,230 to replace one active military man who costs the Government \$2,366, a savings based upon their illogical figures of only \$137 per year per man. Now, remember that even this small "paper" savings will completely vanish and additional expenditures will be required when the standing force has been reduced to a safe minimum and reservists keep pouring in under the permanent peacetime military conscription program.

Those insisting upon the adoption of this wild scheme have advanced no estimates for the billions of dollars' worth of armories and equipment that will necessarily need to be located in every community of this Nation in order to carry out the reserve program for these mil-

lions of Ready Reserves following their training period in order to keep them proficient. Otherwise, the limited training could serve no purpose. Those training planes for the Air Force Reserves, training ships for the Naval Reserves, and up-to-date land equipment—such as tanks, guns, rifles, trucks, jeeps, anti-aircraft facilities, and the like—will cost billions.

When contending that UMT is a money-saving device, the proponents deliberately neglect to inform us that each dependent of the UMT trainees will cost the Government \$40 more than for each dependent of the draftees. A draftee allots \$40 from his pay for dependency purposes. The Government contributes \$45 to the draftee's allotment for each dependent. The UMT trainee would only receive \$30 per month. He will have no \$40 for dependency allotment purposes. Therefore, the Government would contribute, under this proposal, the total \$85 for each dependent of the UMT trainees.

This program, if carried to its ultimate conclusion on a permanent basis, as proposed by this legislation, would eventually bankrupt our Government, and further postpone the build-up of the Air Force and new technical weapons that we so desperately need for our survival in an all-out war, if, God forbid, we should ever have to face that terrible ordeal.

CIVILIAN CONTROL

This legislation provides for a commission of five members—three civilians and two military—to supervise the program in coordination with the Secretary of Defense. Of course, the civilian members of the commission will necessarily depend upon the Secretary of Defense and the military members of the commission to conduct this military program. Surely we have not forgotten that the same civilian-control argument was advanced when we created a Defense Department and provided that the Secretary of Defense must be a civilian. The first emergency afforded the military leaders an opportunity to insist upon a military man being authorized to serve as Secretary of Defense. Of course, it was then easy to change the law because of an emergency and thereby authorize military control of all defenses. Should such a so-called civilian-controlled UMT bill be adopted, it would not be long until some sort of an emergency would make available the opportunity to place complete military control into existence—that is the ultimate goal. We all know what the camel has in mind after he gets his nose under the tent.

If a democracy will not operate during an emergency, it will not operate at all. We always find ourselves in a state of an emergency. I do not look with favor upon the idea of abolishing democratic principles upon the excuse that an emergency warrants such action.

CONCLUSION

Military training for every physically and mentally qualified young man would be helpful to the individual and to the Nation. This training should be afforded in accordance with other proven systems of training and educating our youth. I

would like for every young man to know military tactics, and, certainly, be properly trained before called upon to serve his Nation during an emergency, but I do not believe it is necessary to militarize our boys in order to accomplish this benefit.

We could never match man for man the communistic armies of Russia. That is not our means for victory. We must maintain a great economic strength rather than create internal difficulties growing out of discontent, resulting from inflation, shortages, and governmental regulations. This UMT proposal will weaken rather than strengthen our Nation.

Finally, there seems to be nothing that UMT could add to our defense against communism as long as the present emergency exists. Then, it should be better to wait until we can consider the merits of universal military training calmly and not on an emotional basis arising out of the present emergency.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak against this universal military training bill, H. R. 5904, which provides for the placing of every 18-year-old boy in the Armed Forces for 6 months, after which he will be placed in the Ready Reserve for 7½ years, subject to the call to active duty. I want to state categorically, and state it for the RECORD, that I am strongly opposed to its enactment and that I am going to vote against it. I call upon my colleagues to do likewise.

I am opposed to it because the facts show that UMT is neither necessary nor desirable. It is unnecessary because we already have a selective-service law which provides adequate authority to keep our Armed Forces at any desired strength to meet any emergency. UMT is undesirable because it is something alien to American principles and our democratic traditions—its purpose is to give the Pentagon permanent military control of our youth, and its effect will tend to militarize our country.

The military has been propagandizing for UMT for a long time—they like the idea of UMT because it will give the military clique a new and dominating position in the political life of our country. Taking advantage of the present emergency situation, they seek to secure congressional approval of UMT as a permanent program. They are seeking to sell to the country a fixed national policy of military conscription by making the dishonest claim that it is an emergency measure. Yet the facts show that the UMT program is a peacetime training program which cannot be put into effect during the present emergency except in a very limited and modified form. I resent this effort to stampede the public and the Congress into enacting a law that is to go into effect in the future, and a law which, if considered under more calm and sober days later on, would never be enacted by Congress.

Were this program a sound and constructive one, such as is in effect in Switzerland and Sweden, where trainees are under control of a civilian board, and where emphasis is upon the wholesome growth, education, and development of their young lads, then I would be prepared to consider the proposal.

But I have lost all confidence in the ability of the Pentagon's fitness to take jurisdiction over the lives and future of kids just out of high school. The Military Establishment has, by its bungling and gross mismanagement of the Reserve and National Guard programs, invoked little confidence in its capacity to train and treat properly kids of 18.

During the last 2 years I have received innumerable letters from reservists and national guardists who have been recalled to active duty, and from their wives, fathers, and mothers, and have also talked with them personally. These letters and my personal investigation of the facts of each situation support one conclusion—the conclusion that the Pentagon has been inefficient and callous in their treatment of members of the Reserve and the National Guard. The Pentagon has been wholly indifferent to the personal problems of those who have been called to active duty and have given no consideration to their family and home problems. The Pentagon has had little respect for human values—no regard for the individual. All, it possesses, and this is its motive in advocating this bill, is an insatiable craving for power and a desire to build a military empire whereby they will be able to satisfy their personal ambitions.

I resent this concentrated drive by the Pentagon to impose a military system upon our country which is so completely contrary and alien to democratic principles. It has always been my understanding that the military should be subservient to civilian control, and that the task of the military was to carry out the policies determined by the Congress. Yet in recent months we have seen a well organized propaganda campaign on the part of the military to promote this UMT program. If it wasn't for this high-powered military propaganda, Congress would not be debating this bill today. Every national farm, religious, and labor organization is against this bill, as well as most educational associations and thinking people everywhere. The fact that this bill ever got out of committee indicates the growing political strength of the military oligarchy. The House should vote this bill down by a big majority and the Congress should tell the Pentagon brass in no uncertain terms to stay on their own side of the Potomac River—they have a big enough job to do as it is without trying to dictate policy to the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, there are many, many objections to this bill, and these have been outlined in great detail by my colleagues who have spoken before me in this debate, so I will not take up time to discuss the matter further. I close by saying once again that universal military training has no place in a democratic society and I call upon the House to vote it down.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remaining 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this has been a healthy debate.

But the question still remains, Do the American people want UMT?

Public-opinion polls indicate that the people overwhelmingly support UMT.

And, as always, there are organizations for it, and there are organizations against it.

As usual, the military and the Pentagon have been the whipping boys. The same men that you shower honors upon and applaud loudly when the destiny of the Nation is at stake are now accused of seeking to throttle the Nation.

UMT has been called impractical and expensive. No one has indicated why it is impractical, and no one has been able to show why it will not save money; so again the opponents have turned to generalities, and again they have attacked the military.

I find it strange to understand why some of the opponents of UMT now take the position that once a man has entered the Reserve as a result of his service in the Armed Forces, that he thereafter should be the one to be called in the event of further emergency.

No one has answered the point that we have reiterated again and again that UMT will equalize the obligation to serve the Nation.

No one who opposes UMT has yet suggested any plan that would protect our veterans from recall again and again. No one has offered any constructive alternative to the bill now before the House.

We have been told by some that—oh, yes; they favor UMT, always have; but not the way it is presented in this bill. Our freedoms, they say, require a different system. They offer no alternative; they just do not think this is the proper method. They say it is wrong to take a boy for 6 months and train him and then put him in the Reserve. But, in the same breath, they argue that they have always been for selective service, which takes a man for 24 months and then puts him in the Reserve.

We can have adequate national security and reduced costs if we adopt this legislation and initiate a program of universal military training.

We can have that adequate defense by building a Ready Reserve composed of men recently trained for a period of 6 months. We can also have adequate defense by maintaining an armed force of three and one-half to four million men for an indefinite period.

There is no easy way out of this. You cannot have your cake and eat it too.

There are some among you apparently who think it is perfectly proper to defer a young man in college—the rich man's son if you will—but draft the boy who cannot afford to go to college. And then if you need his services again, break up his home, destroy his business, and order him back to active duty.

We have tried to give you the best bill we know how to prepare. If we have failed it is because you have not offered any constructive suggestions as a substitute.

We have been criticized for bowing to the Pentagon, and yet the Pentagon had nothing to do with the writing of this bill. Even the Commission has been attacked as a hand-picked group of men who wish to impose this obligation upon every young man because they are supposedly the tools of the Pentagon.

Can you honestly and sincerely attack the patriotic motives of men like Jim Wadsworth, who served in the House and in the Senate of the United States for many years? Can you honestly argue that Karl Compton, one of the Nation's greatest educators and scientists, would recommend something that would destroy our educational system?

Can you honestly and in good conscience ridicule the men who support this program? Do you think DICK RUSSELL, HARRY BYRD, LYNDON JOHNSON, ESTES KEFAUVER, LESTER HUNT, JOHN STENNIS, RUSSELL LONG, STYLES BRIDGES, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, WAYNE MORSE, WILLIAM KNOWLAND, HARRY CAIN, and RALPH FLANDERS are seeking to put our American youth in bondage?

Do you think that men like STERLING COLE, TOM MARTIN, OVERTON BROOKS, JIMMY VAN ZANDT, FRANCK HAVENNER, LEROY JOHNSON, GENE COX, JOHN MCCORMACK, SAM RAYBURN, DICK RICHARDS, PAUL KILDAY, and many many others would approve a program that was not in the best interest of the American people?

There is been a lot of talk in the House about recommitting this bill. The talk goes something like that: "The bill needs further study." But what is meant is this: "It's an election year. This is a hot issue, let's not pass on it this year. Let's recommit the bill."

We all have a duty to perform as Congressmen. A duty that requires an honest forthright decision on our part. And this House has never failed to meet any issue that calls for a positive decision. The welfare of our Nation is always in our decisions. I am confident that a decision will be reached in the same manner in this bill.

If you have constructive suggestions on the type of program you want, offer your amendments and let the House pass on them. If you cannot suggest anything constructive and if you recognize the fact that we have presented the only reasonable plan for implementing universal military training, then I know you will have the courage of your convictions, and will support this measure.

We can reduce our Armed Forces with an adequate reserve. We can build up an adequate reserve with UMT. We can equalize the burden to serve the Nation through UMT. We can spend ourselves into bankruptcy through the maintenance of a large standing force for an indefinite period. Or we can adopt the alternative proposed in this bill.

How many Members of this House complained bitterly during World War II that our boys are being sent to the front without adequate training? How many of you have uttered that same complaint about the boys who were sent to Korea in the early stages of that war? Let us prevent that from ever happening again by providing our young men with adequate training while there is time to do so.

Take your stand on this measure.

Vote it up or vote it down.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5904) to provide for the administration and discipline of the National Security Training Corps, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point or in the Appendix of the Record on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlemen from Georgia?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. SUTTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. LYLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. TOLLEFSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered, and to revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

NEBRASKA FOUNDERS' DAY, 1952

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, 85 years ago—on March 1, 1867—Nebraska became a State.

The honoring of this event in 1952 is an occasion of double solemnity. The late Senator Wherry was born at Liberty, Nebr., on February 28, 1892—the day before the State he so ably served in the United States Senate was 25 years old. The late Karl Stefan, Member of the House of Representatives, whom I follow into the position of dean of the Nebraska delegation in Congress, was born in Bohemia—in what is now Czechoslovakia—on March 1, 1884, on the very day the State he so ably served became 17 years old.

I might add that during his 17 years in the House of Representatives, it was a tradition for Mr. Stefan to deliver a little tribute to Nebraska on her birthday. He did this because Nebraska's birthday was on the same day as his. Because I am a firm believer in tradition, I am today continuing this act of my late colleague in paying respects to the finest State in the Union.

What I could say to—and of—these patriotic, self-sacrificing Nebraskans, both of whom died in the service of their State and their Republic—would be not enough. It requires the depth of understanding, the power of expression of Abraham Lincoln to do them justice. The Great Emancipator said in his

Gettysburg Address of November 19, 1863:

It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to the cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that Government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

One of the great forces which moved both Ken and Karl—as so many of us knew them—was their genuine love for the State of Nebraska and the people in it. I share that real, that genuine love with them.

Nebraska—and the inhabitants of Nebraska—have been on the right side even before history.

The skeleton of the largest elephant yet discovered was found in Lincoln County, Nebr. That is symbolic.

The group of prehistoric farmers who lived in almost all of the valleys of Nebraska, except the eastern Missouri bluffs, have been given the name of the "Republican People."

The Nebraska Pawnee Nation is divided into four tribes—one of which is called the Kitke-hahk-i or Republican Tribe.

Maj. Stephen H. Long, in his 1819 account of his map-making expedition between the Platte and the Red River of Texas, wrote falsely of Nebraska, saying:

It is almost wholly unfit for cultivation and, of course, uninhabitable for people depending upon agriculture for their existence.

Major Long's statement was disproved before it was made. Manuel Lisa, Omaha fur trader, had introduced and was doing a thriving business in cattle, hogs, fowl, squash, lima beans, potatoes, and turnips as early as 1807.

A trained observer, George Catlin, who painted Nebraska scenery and Nebraska Indians in 1832, gave the lie to the Long statement when he wrote:

There is no more beautiful prairie country in the world than that which is to be seen here. . . . The surface of the country is gracefully and slightly undulating, like the swells of the ocean after a heavy storm, and everywhere covered with beautiful green turf, and with occasional patches and clusters of trees. The soil in this region is also rich and capable of making one of the most beautiful and productive countries of the world.

It remained for the Fair Deal, misnamed "Voice of America," to repeat the Long falsehood to the world, claiming that—in 1945—Nebraska was a part of the great American desert.

The man who was to be later the first Republican candidate for President—then Lt. John C. Frémont, known as "The Pathfinder"—gave Nebraska its name. In his 1844 report to the Secretary of War, William Wilkins, Lieutenant Frémont wrote:

The Platte, or Nebraska, River being the center stream would very properly furnish a name to the Territory. Troops and supplies

from the Nebraska Territory would be able to contend for Oregon with any force coming from the sea.

Nebraskans came to our State to stay. On January 2, 1862—over 5 years before the Territory became a State—Daniel Freeman, first Nebraska homesteader, claimed 160 acres on Cub Creek, near Beatrice. Since that date over a million homesteaders have settled more than 120,000,000 acres—all over the Republic. Of this number, 100,000 homesteaders have claimed Nebraska land.

It was the homesteaders—the men, women, and children who had their parcel of land, hard won from the blizzard, the prairie fire, the drought, the deluge, and the Indian—who most wanted statehood for Nebraska. By accident of the times, since the Republic was engaged in the great Civil War at the very hour of the passage of the first Homestead Act—most of the early Nebraska landowners were Republicans.

The Democrats, unsuccessfully, opposed statehood.

Once Nebraska became a State, on March 1, 1867, its feet were firmly planted on the road to progress.

Southerner and northerner forgot their hatreds after the Civil War. The State's rights stand of the southerner merged with the thrifty virtues of the Yankee to bring forth the Nebraskan. The land know-how of the Swede, the orderly thought of the German, the mechanical ability of the Bohemian, the governing knack of the Irish, the drive of the French, the colonizing tradition of the English—mingled to make Nebraska great.

The motto on the great seal of the State of Nebraska in 1867 was "Equality before the law." Thank God, in the 85 years of our statehood, we have kept it that way.

We have never tolerated a corrupt government in our State.

We have never tolerated a spendthrift government in our State.

We have never tolerated a treacherous government in our State.

Nebraskans are, and always have been honest, solvent, and patriotic.

Nebraskans believe that the same standards of human conduct which have continued to apply to them should apply to the Republic as a whole.

It has cost Nebraska nothing in material progress or in governmental accomplishments to be known far and wide as the State in which Christianity is practiced as well as preached.

Although our cement, clay, and stone products are among the most widely known in the American building industry, it is the field of agriculture where we have won our highest awards.

We lead all States in the production of wild hay. We are front-rank producers of corn, oats, wheat, barley, rye, alfalfa, potatoes, sugar beets, sorghums, and soy beans. We are well above other States, greater in size or in population, in producing cattle, hogs, and sheep. Omaha has been, for some time, the first city in the world in butter manufacturing. Of our 77,237 square miles of area, approximately a million acres have been made to produce more and better farm products through irrigation.

We have the only unicameral State Legislature in the United States. A Nebraskan can progress from kindergarten to a doctor of philosophy degree without leaving his State. To me, and to most of my fellow citizens, the noblest product of Nebraska is and always will be the Nebraskan.

What is a Nebraskan?

Two years ago, on this very day, my late friend—Karl Stefan—defined a Nebraskan.

A Nebraskan—

Karl Stefan said—

is a forward-looking American, with a long, long memory.

That definition is good enough for me. I hope and pray that it is good enough for you.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, since my discharge as a private soldier in World War I, I have earnestly advocated universal military training and have fervently hoped such training would become a reality. My interest was not because of a militaristic temperament, for I hate war. I have every reason to hate war, a reason shared in common with my people and my section. Beginning with the Revolutionary War, my people have died and lived for our country. It would be informative for the public to learn how much of the Revolutionary War was fought on southern soil, and the wonderful contribution made by my people in behalf of our country in the wars that have followed.

My interest in universal military training is because I personally knew many fine boys who died for our country in World War I simply because of a lack of training, and who if they had been given an equal chance through training would now perhaps be living for our country, and would have had the satisfaction of making the enemy die for this country.

I did not foresee the fact that this year I would have the power to vote for or against this important bill, as I did not foresee that this issue would come before us at a time when it would or could be used as a means of carrying on a social revolution against a loyal people and a wonderful section of our great country, nor did my section foresee such. They join me in deep regret that such is unfortunately the case.

I come from a loyal and devoted constituency, and a religious God-fearing and enlightened people. This statement is so widely understood that in emergencies, such as we have been in for many years, I fear my people and my section are penalized and mistreated because it is known that we are loyal Americans, and can always be counted on to submerge our personal rights in the Nation's interest. I ask now, why are we so treated? Has this House forgotten that prior to Pearl Harbor and the draft that the South and West furnished 14 out of

every 17 soldiers for our armed services? Has this House, and this Nation so speedily forgotten how southern Congressmen voting unanimously saved this country when lend-lease and the Draft Act were passed by a two-vote and a one-vote margin. These facts should be engraved on every human heart. Are not people like that entitled to be considered?

In this bill it will be proposed to write in an amendment by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD]. I declare to this body that this will be a test of the fairness my people can expect, for without hesitation I say that amendment is as fair a writing as has ever been penned, and is subject to no just criticism at the hands of any race or group whatever. It is a wonderful expression of democracy. It is an amendment which I can see no reason for anyone to complain of. The amendment will provide that any boy shall have the right to serve in a mixed unit if he desires, and anyone desiring to serve in a mixed unit will be accommodated, thereby completely wiping out the cry of discrimination. The amendment will also provide that a boy can express his desire to serve in a unit of his race, and the rank and file of my people want that right—both white and colored. I know the colored people as few here know them, having lived all of my life in a county where the colored people outnumber the white people about 3 to 1. The colored in my section almost unanimously would appreciate serving with their own race, for the reasons that they would find themselves in a more congenial atmosphere, would be happy, and would more easily attain a corporal's or sergeant's rating in competition with only members of their race. Frankly, and unfortunately for our country, if we stop there, there would be no objections raised from any quarter. The objections come with the realization that the white boy could express his preference and serve in a unit of his own race. I have to pinch myself to realize I am living in such an age, but it is true and cannot be disputed.

Congress has great power and, therefore, that power should be fairly and cautiously exercised. I do not believe Congress can escape condemnation if it fails to adopt the Winstead amendment, thereby saying to the boys of America: "We are taking you from your homes without consulting you. Doubtless, you will defend us on far-flung battlefields and many of you will become a sacrifice for our safety at a time when you are in the bloom of youth, and most in love with life, but not withstanding this, we are going to make you the guinea pig for a social experiment."

Regardless of what we Congressmen may say, not a Member of Congress has seen fit to practice such themselves. To fail to give an American boy, who we are placing in involuntary service, a freedom of choice provided in the Winstead amendment, and to make these boys the first group in this country to lose that freedom although they have committed no crime, but were simply unfortunate in being born when they were, will do violence to our concepts beyond repair.

This is plain talk, but it is true. It is now time for plain talk. My people resent this social revolution being waged under unfair terms and under a period of emergency. Why should they not resent it? Why should we be so dealt with because of our loyalty? Why should we be interested in kow-towing to Russia's views, and so completely determined to ignore the wishes of the South, both white and colored, and white and colored in every corner of the United States? In my section we have long recognized Russia and her satellites, the Communists and their fellow travelers in the United States, including Washington, to be exactly what they are. We want no part of Russia's philosophy and we want no part in appeasing Russia, if loyal citizens of this country lose any just right in so doing.

My people know that we have kow-towed to Russia and to Russia's disciples and un-American groups in this country entirely too long. My people insist and demand that those advocating the violent overthrow of our form of government be dealt with in the manner that they deserve—speedily. My people have never had the idea that if we bothered this vermin in America we would run them underground, but on the contrary, my people think that underground about 6 feet is exactly where they belong.

My people want peace, but not at any price. We would not consider bargaining away our form of government and our belief in God for anything Russia, or communism, can offer.

My people are a patient people. A people who maintain their equilibrium. They are people who can endure wrongs, and history proves we have endured many. My people will not let this country down in an emergency. Do not forget that. Do not believe that a defeat of this Winstead amendment would be a means to cause us to turn against that which our country must have. Take that amendment and deal with it on its merits. Consider the letter of Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, and while I deeply deplore the terrible wrongs that she says will be inflicted upon my people, I give her credit for being honest, and admit that she did not give us the run-around as is so often the case in Washington.

Consider our pleas for fair play. Whatever you do now will be remembered by my people. Some day, if my people have their way, this emergency will be brought to an end victoriously under the banner of God and freedom. Punish us now if you will, but the time will come perhaps when there is no emergency, and then the resentment of my people, so justly aroused, will be demonstrated in an intelligent way.

I deeply regret that the House Armed Services Committee did not make the Winstead amendment a part of this bill, for if it had, the amendment would have passed. I observe that not a member of that committee has done anything to demonstrate his willingness to live under conditions that will be inflicted upon these boys. I ask that committee now to accept the Winstead amendment. You cannot defend a contrary position by pointing to your lives or practices. I ask every Member of the House in-

terested in giving these boys the privileges provided in the Winstead amendment to be on the floor and vote for that amendment. You will live to be proud of that kind of vote. I sincerely hope and pray that this amendment will pass, but whether it does or not, I will have the satisfaction of knowing I have placed before you the case of my people and yours. My people in Georgia, the South, the 48 States, and the boys who this bill is directed against, will know that they had a friend at court this day. I plead for all races and all groups that they shall have the rights the Winstead amendment gives.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

WASTE BY THE MILITARY

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, day before yesterday during the general debate on the UMT bill the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] yielded to me and I made a statement about waste by the military and referred to \$27,000 that had been spent under the supervision of Lt. Gen. Edward H. Brooks, commanding general, Second Army, at A. P. Hill Military Reservation in Virginia on a hunting lodge. I said it was taxpayers' money that is being wasted.

The United Press got a story from Fort Meade saying a spokesman of Brooks asserted:

There is no hunting lodge at A. P. Hill. There has been no construction work there since the war. Brooks does not own a hunting lodge. He has not spent \$27,000 or any taxpayers' money on a hunting lodge either for his own use or for the use of other officers or persons. He has a sergeant as driver for his official car which is used only for Government business.

Mr. Speaker, when I was informed of this \$27,000 of the taxpayers' money being wasted, it came through a friend of mine, a boy whom I trust implicitly. I know his reputation for truth and veracity, and, as far as I was concerned, he did not have to be under oath for me to believe him. So I related the information he gave me here on the floor because I thought the American people, the taxpayers, who are suffering from high taxes, should know how General Brooks was wasting their money. The general came back, of course, through a spokesman, and denied it.

That afternoon I put in a long-distance call to my friend to verify the facts he told me. He said what he had told me was true; that he had been at the lodge. I cannot mention the boy's name. He is still in the Army. He would be railroaded right straight to Korea if I were to mention his name. A case like that happened this morning to a boy I defended in a court-martial case. He was shipped out of Fort Meade this morning, but he has just 25 days left in the Army, thank goodness, under General Brooks.

So not only to verify this boy's word and to try to find out the truth of the matter, yesterday morning I got in my car and drove the seventy-odd miles

down to A. P. Hill to see for myself if there was a hunting lodge there, whether there had been any new construction since the war, whether there was a sergeant or anyone else down there and a house boy taking care of the place. Since General Brooks' spokesman said there was no lodge there or that any money had been spent, I wanted to find out; I thought we were entitled to know.

Mr. Speaker, when I got to Bowling Green, Va., I asked a civilian, "Where is the officers' club here on A. P. Hill Reservation?" He said, "There is no officers' club here. There are only three officers down here. But," he said "General Brooks has a private hunting lodge here," and he told me where it was. Then I drove on down the road, and stopped at Crabtree's, who run an Esso service station and a restaurant. I said, "Mr. Crabtree, you have been here a long time. Where is the officers' club down here?" He said, "There is no officers' club here. There are but two officers here, but General Brooks has a hunting lodge down here," and he showed me how to find the General's lodge. I noticed right at the entrance of A. P. Hill a sign, it said, "A. P. Hill Military Reservation—welcome." There were no MPs there. I drove on in. I had a taxpayer from my district with me. His name is Ernest Raspberry, from Lewis County, Tenn. Hohenwald is the name of the town, and I guess Ernest is one of the largest taxpayers there; I imagine he pays as much taxes as any man in Lewis County. So, I took him with me. I drove on and I came to a one-way road, winding through the wilderness—it was beautiful. I drove about 6 miles from the headquarters, then I spotted a beautiful lake. As I wound on around the little ravines, on top of a hill I saw the most magnificent lodge I had ever seen in my life. Well, I drove on up to the lodge. I heard music inside. I knocked on the door. It was locked. Finally, a sergeant opened the door. He looked at my license tag—my car had the congressional tag on—and then let me in. When I got inside, I said, "Sutton is my name." He said, "Sergeant Summerfield is mine." There was a colored private there.

I said, "What are you doing around here, Sergeant?"

He said, "We are cleaning up the lodge."

I said, "What do you use this lodge for? Is it an officers' club?"

He said, "No." "It is for private parties. We had a big one a couple of weeks ago."

I said, "Sergeant, may I look through?"

He said, "I guess so."

I said, "When did you come down here?"

He said, "I just got here yesterday."

I said, "Why did you just come here yesterday?" That was the day that I made the statement of the \$27,000 being expended there.

He said, "Well, Sergeant Graves has been the sergeant at the lodge down here, but Saturday night he had a wreck, so I was sent down here to replace him."

I went through that lodge, Mr. Speaker, from top to bottom. It has nine bathrooms in it. You can imagine the

size of it. Yet there is no hunting lodge down there. I asked the colored boy, "How many bedrooms do you have here? About eight?"

He said, "No, sir; I guess we have nine, because we have nine bathrooms."

And there was no money spent, no \$27,000, or any part of the taxpayers' money, according to the spokesman for General Brooks.

In the kitchen there were two brand new electric stoves. One of them a Westinghouse. I do not remember what the other one was. There were so many of them down there I could not remember which one was in the kitchen. There were two brand new refrigerators. One of them was a Crosley, the other was an International Harvester. There was new formica all over the tops of the kitchen cabinets. New inlaid linoleum on the barroom floor.

I asked Sergeant Summerfield: "When were these refrigerators sent here?" He said, "I brought this International Harvester down from Fort Meade last Thursday."

I went on through this lodge. In the dining room there was beautiful walnut furniture, new. No money had been spent, though. I went on upstairs, into the attic. I thought maybe they had moved some of the furniture. I believe they had moved some of the furniture, because upstairs in the attic there were some new beds, rollaway beds that had been hidden or stored. There was no dust or cobwebs on them.

Mr. Speaker, I looked behind the chimney, and what do you think I found? I found a dice board. I wonder if the taxpayers have been paying for running a gambling device at the general's lodge—at this not-supposed-to-be lodge, on the A. P. Hill Reservation?

So I left his lodge, with regrets, because it is so beautiful. I would love to have a retreat like that myself. If that hunting lodge did not cost \$50,000, I am not standing in the well of this House today. If I had \$50,000, I would gladly give it for it, with its magnificent setting.

Then on another hill adjacent to the lodge was a beautiful bath house. I asked the colored boy, "When was that constructed?" He said, "I don't know, sir, but they tell me they built it last year." You can tell by the roof and the building itself that it had not been there 2 years, much less 10 years.

Then I went on down to another building, and there was another sergeant who drove up with a Mr. Ackerman. I asked what their jobs were. They were taking care of the forest, they said, and they were lowering the lake 2 feet so that they could kill weeds, so that when the general came down there with his fishing parties there would not be many weeds around.

I asked him about the garage. There was a new apartment over a double garage. I said, "When was that built?" He said, "About 6 months ago, I think." I said, "Who is it for?" "General Brooks' chauffeurs, when they are here." There was a new refrigerator and new stove in the garage apartment.

Oh, yes, Mr. Speaker, I want you to know that this lodge is heated with oil. The heating system has been recently

installed. But no money has been spent there.

Then I went over to another building which they were remodeling. Why do I say they were remodeling? Because they had recently sanded two floors and varnished them, and sanded another but had not yet varnished it. Apparently no one had walked on it.

I went outside, and going up the hill to the house were new concrete steps that obviously had not been built 2 weeks, because the forms had not even been removed. No construction since the war, though.

Mr. Speaker, to me General Brooks' statement is nothing but intentional misrepresentation, this statement here by the spokesman of General Brooks. In plain Tennessee language, that is lying. Sergeant Summerfield was cleaning the place with a colored private. He had taken Sergeant Graves' place. Do you think this was not using the taxpayers' money? And in this building, there was a sign—a group of signs—there—incidentally, all this section down there is in a game preserve—and there were signs all along the road, "Game preserve." Then there was a sign up on a tree, I would say it was 16 or 18 inches square "Off limits to all military personnel." I asked the sergeant, "Why is that sign there?" He said, "When the general is here, he does not want the troops that may be on maneuvers coming up and asking for a drink of water. He does not want to be bothered with them."

Whose lodge is it? Naturally, General Brooks does not own it. The Government owns it. It is on a 77,000-acre Government reservation. But, he is the commanding general of the Second Army.

Mr. Speaker, if that is the best generalship we have in this United States Army, I feel sorry for this country of ours. If he is the most capable officer we have to run the Second Army of the United States of America, we had better disband the Second Army and let them join in with the First or the Third Armies. It is men like Lt. Gen. Edward H. Brooks that make the people in the United States Congress fight the brass. It is men like Lt. Gen. Edward H. Brooks that make many of us doubt whether we should have universal military training because we would go militaristic under men like him.

Mr. Speaker, last evening a man came by my office by the name of John Hensley who lives in Arlington. He saw service with the Second Airborne in World War II. He trained down at A. P. Hill with the Rangers. He has a wonderful war record. He was shot six times, and made nine jumps behind the enemy lines as a Ranger. He trained at A. P. Hill from May 1941 until November 1941, he said, "We bivouacked right on that lake. There was no lodge there then." He said, "There was only one building there and that was the building that has been remodeled." He said, "We shot that up even with 75-millimeter guns and used it as a target and for practice booby traps." He said, "There was no bathhouse there. That is as late as November 1941." He said, "There was no lodge there." That is as late as November

1941. And yet they say there has been no construction since World War II.

I was talking with a man this morning who said that the lodge had been built since World War II. He is checking now on the exact date, and when I find out, I am going to let the Congress know exactly when it was built, and he thinks he will have the date and figure as to what it cost to build it, and I want Congress to know that too.

Mr. Speaker, I am preparing an hour's speech on wastefulness in the Second Army under leadership of Lt. Gen. Edward H. Brooks. Within about 2 weeks, I hope to have it ready and speak to the Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, on February 8, 1951, in the well of this House, I exposed the pastel mink coat. At that time you probably remember the byword and watchword of all American people was "Throw the rascals out." The American people believe in throwing the rascals out of the Government, and so do I, otherwise I would not have exposed the mink coat. We should extend that not only to this Government, but I say, "Throw the rascals out of the military too, and let us stop this waste."

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

TELEVISION AND BROADCASTING OF LEGISLATIVE, INVESTIGATORY PROCEEDINGS, AND JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, some days ago the Chair, in the discharge of his responsibility, ruled that radio broadcasting and televising of hearings and proceedings before committees of the United States House of Representatives were not authorized by the present rules. The Chair did not, and was not in a position to, express an opinion as to the advisability of broadcasting and televising such proceedings. Nevertheless much has been said since that time concerning the problem which is obviously upon us.

I am pleased to insert at this point, a report by a committee of the American Bar Association to the board of governors of that association concerning its findings and recommendations with reference to the televising and broadcasting of legislative investigatory proceedings and judicial proceedings. This report was recently adopted by the house of delegates, the policymaking body of the American Bar Association, and it will be read with profit:

FEBRUARY 11, 1952.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS,
American Bar Association,
Chicago, Ill.

GENTLEMEN: At your meeting in May 1951 you adopted a report and recommendation to the following effect:

1. That the televising and broadcasting of judicial proceedings are clearly matters of

grave concern to the American Bar Association.

2. That, while the propriety of televising and broadcasting the debates in the Congress and other legislative assemblies ordinarily rests with those bodies, the televising and broadcasting of legislative investigatory proceedings set up for the ascertainment of facts as a basis for legislation, legal prosecutions and other judicial proceedings are matters of concern to this association.

3. That televising and broadcasting hearings and investigatory proceedings basic to or touching matters of law enforcement or for ultimate judicial consideration present questions of such grave implications to the cause of the administration of justice that the subject merits the serious attention of this association.

4. That a committee be appointed to make a full appraisal of this subject and to report its recommendations.

In pursuance of this recommendation the then president of the American Bar Association appointed the undersigned as a committee for the purpose outlined and this committee has been continued under the administration of the sitting president. We beg to submit the following report.

The questions are obviously of general interest and are being increasingly discussed in the public press and among the members of the bar.¹ Yet in view of the novelty of the inventions involved, particularly that of television, it is not surprising that there is little field of practical experience on which to draw. Nor have there been any controlling court decisions or statutes (other than the one in California) regarding television which have come to the attention of your committee.²

¹ E. g., Gossett, *Justice and TV*, 38 ABAJ 15 (1952); Arnold, *Mob Justice and Television*, XII Fed. Com. B. J. 4 (1951); Taylor, *The Issue Is Not TV, But Fair Play*, XII Fed. Com. B. J. 10 (1951); Charnley, *Should Courtroom Proceedings Be Broadcast?* XI Fed. Com. B. J. 64 (1950); *State Legislation Affecting Radio and Television in 1949*, X Fed. Com. B. J. 208 (1949); 10 See Magazine 28 (November 1951); Klots, *Trial By Television*, 203 Harper's 90 (October 1951); *Time*, April 16, 1951, p. 57, column 1; *U. S. News and World Report*, March 30, 1951, p. 60, column 1; *New York Times*, January 27, 1952, p. 10E, column 3; *New York Herald Tribune*, January 26, 1952, p. 7, column 6; *New York Herald Tribune*, January 16, 1952, p. 12, column 3; *New York Times* magazine, January 13, 1952, p. 12; *New York Times*, January 12, 1952, p. 15, column 5; *New York Herald Tribune*, December 21, 1951, p. 21, column 1; *New York Times*, December 19, 1951, p. 48, column 1; *New York Times*, September 20, 1951, p. 28, column 7; *New York Herald Tribune*, September 12, 1951, p. 4, column 3; *New York Herald Tribune*, September 7, 1951, p. 17, column 3; *New York Times*, September 1, 1951, p. 7, column 2; *New York Herald Tribune*, August 12, 1951, p. 4, column 1; *New York Times*, August 11, 1951, p. 1, column 2; *New York Times*, June 24, 1951, a series of articles begun by Jack Gould; *New York Times*, June 19, 1951, p. 31, column 5; *the Washington Post*, June 9, 1951, p. 6, column 1; *the Detroit News*, April 1, 1951, p. 15, column 1; *the New York Post*, March 27, 1951, a series of articles begun by Max Lerner; *the Association of the Bar of the City of New York: Report on Radio and Television Broadcasting of Hearings of Congressional Investigating Committees* (1952) and *Report on Congressional Investigations* (1948); 62 reports of American Bar Association 851 (1937).

² Those of the States concerning themselves with television have dealt principally with the law of libel and slander and 25

The subject, therefore, can be discussed only on the basis of guiding principles.

I

Broadcasting of proceedings before congressional committees has become a more or less familiar process. The use of television, however, as a necessary adjunct of congressional investigations is a phenomenon of recent occurrence. The full impact of such a televised investigation was felt in the widely publicized hearings before the Senate Special Committee to Investigate Organized Crime.

The propriety of televising and broadcasting debates in Congress and other legislative assemblies is a matter with which this association is probably not concerned. It is the membership of such bodies that must determine whether the practice is good or bad. But where the question has to do with the proceedings of legislative investigations, in which witnesses drawn from the general citizenship are presented, it is obvious that private rights are involved.

The use of television and broadcasting apparatus in such investigations is defended on the ground that it arouses public interest and more active scrutiny of governmental affairs; that this makes for better informed citizenry and for more efficient public servants. It is said, not without force, that television has become the greatest single educational arm available to congressional committees by which the public conscience may be reached.³

These are undoubtedly laudable ends. When they can be pursued without impinging on the rights of private citizens, no one could object. The committee notes with approval the pending efforts in Congress to frame a code of procedure for congressional investigating committees which will obviate some past criticisms.

Few are the witnesses who approach the witness stand, either before a legislative committee or, as we shall later remark, before a court, without some feeling of nervous embarrassment. When, in addition to the audience before them they are made aware that they are at one and the same time appearing before and being heard by an audience numbering millions, their psychological discomfort is inevitably increased. The self-confident who may escape this sensation are tempted by their voice, conduct and general bearing, even by the substance of their testimony, to play to this large gallery. To this temptation even legislators or counsel may not be entirely resistant.

The television camera is a force the power of which is only beginning to be appreciated. Granted that it greatly enhances the public interest in current events, it can also circulate with great speed baseless accusations which may be to the irreparable injury of the persons accused. It may often, perhaps usually, be the case that this public view of any proceeding is only intermittent. The result may well be a distorted impression of the facts and a consequent prejudgment of the witness by the viewers without regard to the legal presumption of innocence to which the witness is entitled.⁴ Your committee is well aware that newspaper reports may also by their necessary brevity give a distorted

of the States have adopted statutes forbidding a television screen to be exhibited in a motor car within the range of vision of the driver. It is to be expected that all the States will follow in this particular phase of the matter.

Both the Wisconsin and Georgia Legislatures have acted to prohibit the broadcasting of judicial proceedings.

³ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 97, pt. 7, p. 9777.

⁴ Klots, *Trial by Television*, 203 Harper's 90, 91 (October 1951).

impression of the facts, but this regrettable circumstance affords no justification for further distortion incident to the use of television and broadcasting.

Your committee is not prepared to say televising or broadcasting of an unwilling witness is such an infraction of his right to privacy as to be unlawful; yet even where the consent of the witness is invoked there would seem to be an element of unfairness in putting upon him the burden of consent or protest. His very unwillingness to consent might be treated in certain quarters as an unfavorable symptom. These unfavorable aspects become all the more true where the television or broadcasting is concentrated only on selected witnesses or incidents not calculated or intended to represent the proceedings as a whole.

II

Much that has been said in the preceding section on the subject of the televising and broadcasting of congressional investigations applies with increased emphasis to judicial proceedings.

Here the basic contention of the telecasters and broadcasters is that they have an equal right with the representatives of the press to attend and report trials of persons accused of crime or even of private litigation. They urge that since criminal trials are proceedings in their nature public, photographic portrayals of trial scenes are legally as permissible as verbal or written descriptions. It is, they assert, an integral part of the freedom of the press.⁵

Thus far there is no express decision supporting this right to televise or broadcast a trial nor on the other hand one declaring it to be unlawful.⁶ The subject seems to your committee to lie at present within the sound discretion of the court. The judiciary as a coordinate branch of the Government has direct and exclusive control over the proper conduct of trials. It has authority to determine what conduct is compatible with the orderly administration of justice and to that extent it can regulate or prohibit the use of television cameras or broadcasting transmitters or similar devices in or about the courtroom.

The objections to televising or broadcasting congressional investigations, which we have set forth, are, in the main, applicable to the problem of televising or broadcasting trials but your committee believes that there are even more compelling adverse reasons where the courts are concerned. A trial of any kind in any court is a matter of serious importance to all concerned. It is and should be a sober and dispassionate effort to reach the truth concerning the matters in issue. Its primary function is not to entertain nor even to educate or edify the public but to ascertain and enforce the very rights involved. It is not an entertainment or show. To treat trials as mere entertainment, educational or otherwise, is to deprive the court of the dignity which pertains to it and can only impede that serious quest for truth for which all judicial forums are established.

The intrusion into the courtroom of mechanisms which require the participants in a trial consciously to adapt themselves

⁵ See, *Asbury Park Press, Inc., v. City of Asbury Park* (20 U. S. L. Week 2154 (N. J. Oct. 23, 1951)); *United States v. Paramount Pictures* (334 U. S. 131, 166 (1948)); *Irwin v. Ashurst* (158 Ore. 61, 74 F. 2d 1127 (1938)); *Ex Parte Sturm* (152 Md. 114, 136 Atl. 312 (1927)).

⁶ But rule 53 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure and rule 223 (b) of the rules of civil procedure of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania prohibit the taking of photographs or radio broadcasting during the progress of a trial.

to the demands of recording and reproducing devices, and to measure their time accordingly, distracts attention from the single object of promoting justice.¹ The attention of the court, the jury, lawyers, and witnesses should be concentrated upon the trial itself and ought not to be divided with the television or broadcast audience who, for the most part, have merely the interest of curiosity in the proceedings. It is not difficult to conceive that all participants may become overconcerned with the impression their actions, rulings, or testimony will make on the absent multitude.

The educational effect of a televised or broadcast trial on the general public can be but negligible; it may even be detrimental. The experience thus far with radio broadcasting and motion pictures of trials has shown that only the most sordid crimes are likely to be televised. In addition, the undue publicity from the telecasting of criminal trials may pander to the desire of abnormal criminal minds for mock heroics and resulting fame. To sensationalize such trials by television can have but an injurious effect on public morals.

To the accused a trial is an ordeal in itself to which he is commanded by society to submit. There is no necessity for imposing the additional hardship of requiring that the accused, at a time of great emotional distress, must submit to a telecast. There is no need that his humiliation be intensified by compulsory submission to a photographic portrayal for publicity purposes.²

The requirement of a public trial in criminal prosecutions is for the benefit of the accused. It is intended to insure that he is fairly dealt with and not unjustly condemned. This requirement of a public trial was created and satisfied long before television or broadcasting came into being. Public trials would not be less public in the constitutional sense today if these devices were never granted admission to the courts.

The dignity and efficiency of a court in conducting any trial and the right of the parties concerned are certainly entitled to first consideration. Any interest which might be aroused in the general public by televising or broadcasting a proceeding or any part of it is of secondary concern. In the opinion of your committee, the practice should be sternly condemned.

CONCLUSION

Your committee recommends the adoption of the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the American Bar Association condemns the practice of televising or broadcasting the testimony of witnesses when called before investigating committees of Congress and recommends that appropriate action be taken to restrict or prevent it.

Resolved, That the American Bar Association condemns the practice of televising or broadcasting judicial proceedings and recommends that Canon 35 of the Canons of Judicial Ethics be amended to read as follows:

"Proceedings in court should be conducted with fitting dignity and decorum. The taking of photographs in the court room, during sessions of the court or recesses between sessions, and the broadcasting [or telecasting] of court proceedings are calculated to detract from the essential dignity of the proceedings, degrade the court and create misconceptions with respect thereto in the mind of the public and should not be permitted."

Should this canon not be observed, we would favor buttressing it by legislation.

Respectfully submitted,

BRUCE BROMLEY.
JOHN A. DANAHY.
JOSEPH J. DANIELS.
JOSEPH W. HENDERSON.
MONTE M. LEMANN.
WILLIAM A. SCHNADER.
JOHN W. DAVIS,

Chairman.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. WALTER.

Mr. SPENCE and to include an address by Fredy Perlman, of the Dixie Heights High School, Covington, Ky., a native of Czechoslovakia, on the subject of Democracy.

Mr. DORN and to include two articles.

Mr. MADDEN and to include an article appearing in Newsweek magazine.

Mr. PASSMAN and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. YATES and to include an address delivered by Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois.

Mrs. KEE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRICE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MACHROWICZ and to include a telegram.

Mr. BURNSIDE and to include an editorial.

Mr. SHELLEY (at the request of Mr. McKINNON) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CANFIELD on the life of the late Representative Whitaker.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin in four instances and to include in each extraneous material.

Mr. PATTERSON in six instances and to include in each a newspaper item.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin and to include a letter he received.

Mr. SMITH of Kansas and to include an editorial.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LECOMPTÉ and to include editorial comment from the Mississippi Valley Lumberman.

Mr. HAND and to include collateral matter.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include a letter and a resolution.

Mr. MCCORMACK (at the request of Mr. SUTTON).

Mr. SUTTON.

Mr. BOYKIN and to include a speech.

Mr. MILLS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHAFFER in three instances.

Mr. VAN ZANDT and Mr. O'HARA (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) each to include an editorial.

Mr. MILLER of New York (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REED of New York to include in his remarks made earlier today an article relating to universal military training.

Mr. GWINN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. STEED and to include a newspaper article.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, March 3, 1952, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1202. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1203. A letter from the Vice Chairman, District Unemployment Compensation Board, transmitting the Sixteenth Annual Report of the District Unemployment Compensation Board for the year 1951, pursuant to section 13 (c) of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1204. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Thirty-seventh Annual Report of the Federal Trade Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1205. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting report No. 21 of action taken pursuant to section 217 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Public Law 498, 77th Cong.); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1206. A letter from the director, the American Legion, transmitting the final financial statement of the American Legion up to and including the period ending December 31, 1951, pursuant to the Act of Incorporation of the American Legion (Public Law 47, 66th Cong.); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1207. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 28, 1952, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Gallien River, Berrien County, Mich., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1208. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting the annual report of the Federal Power Commission for the fiscal year July 1, 1950, to June 30, 1951; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1209. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a letter relative to urging the Congress to complete action on legislation to authorize a United States contribution of \$12,000,000 to the United Nations Children's Emergency Fund for the fiscal year 1952 (H. Doc. No. 373); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

1210. A letter from the Chairman, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Home Loan Bank Board, transmitting the final report relating to the operations and liquidation of the

¹ 62 Reports of American Bar Association, 851, 864 (1937).

² *Ex parte Sturm* (152 Mr. 114, 136 Atl. 312, 314 (1927)). But cf. *Elmhurst v. Pearson* (153 F. 2d 467 (D. C. Cir. 1945)).

³ Words in brackets added.

Home Owners' Loan Corporation, in accordance with section 20 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GARY: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 6854. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1450). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMAS: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 396. Joint resolution making an appropriation for the Motor Carrier Claims Commission for the fiscal year 1952; without amendment (Rept. No. 1451). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 5735. A bill to require all Federal officers in carrying out laws relating to water-resources development and utilization to comply with the laws of the affected States or Territories; with amendment (Rept. No. 1452). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RICHARDS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Report pursuant to House Resolution 28, Eighty-second Congress, first session. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct thorough studies and investigations of all matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee; without amendment (Rept. No. 1453). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RICHARDS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Report pursuant to House Resolution 28, Eighty-second Congress, first session. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct thorough studies and investigations of all matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee; without amendment (Rept. No. 1454). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RICHARDS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Report pursuant to House Resolution 28, Eighty-second Congress, first session. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct thorough studies and investigations of all matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee; without amendment (Rept. No. 1455). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RICHARDS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Report pursuant to House Resolution 28, Eighty-second Congress, first session. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct thorough studies and investigations of all matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee; without amendment (Rept. No. 1456). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 4323. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into lease-purchase agreements to provide for the lease to the United States of real property and structures for terms of more than 5 years but not in excess of 25 years and for acquisition of

title to such properties and structures by the United States at or before the expiration of the lease terms, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1457). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARDEN: Committee on Education and Labor. H. R. 1499. A bill to amend the act approved August 4, 1919, as amended, providing additional aid for the American Printing House for the Blind; without amendment (Rept. No. 1458). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GARY:
H. R. 6854. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana (by request):
H. R. 6855. A bill to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide a disability rating of 100 percent for the loss or loss of use of one hand or one foot together with blindness of one eye; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:
H. R. 6856. A bill to extend the duration of the Water Pollution Control Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CELLER:
H. R. 6857. A bill to amend section 7a of the act entitled "An act to regulate the employment of minors within the District of Columbia", approved May 29, 1928; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:
H. R. 6858. A bill to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WEICHEL:
H. R. 6859. A bill to amend section 704 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROWNSON:
H. R. 6860. A bill to establish a National Security Training Corps, to provide for its administration and discipline, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KENNEDY:
H. R. 6861. A bill to transfer the trawler *Delaware* from the United States Army Quartermaster Corps to the Fish and Wildlife Service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 6862. A bill to further encourage the distribution of fishery products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. REGAN:
H. R. 6863. A bill to make provision for suitable accommodations for the Bureau of Customs and certain other Government services at El Paso, Tex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THOMAS:
H. J. Res. 396. Joint resolution making an appropriation for the Motor Carrier Claims Commission for the fiscal year 1952; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:
H. Con. Res. 202. Concurrent resolution to declare the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics an aggressor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FARRINGTON:
H. R. 6864. A bill for the relief of Kimiko Fukuda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 6865. A bill for the relief of Midori Kagawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 6866. A bill for the relief of Yukiko Nerita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 6867. A bill for the relief of Susumu Sasaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 6868. A bill for the relief of Fumie Shimoko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLMES:
H. R. 6869. A bill for the relief of Wong Yang Yee and Wong Sue Chee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL:
H. R. 6870. A bill for the relief of Louie Bon Kong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:
H. R. 6871. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gloria Wilson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

598. By the SPEAKER: Petition of California State Society of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, Los Angeles, Calif., relative to certain resolutions passed by the California State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, at the Forty-fourth State Conference on February 15, 1952, at Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on House Administration.

599. Also, petition of Miss Bernice Kleinman and others, New York, N. Y., relative to bringing the murderers of Harry T. Moore and his wife Harriet, in Florida, to justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

600. Also, petition of chief clerk, City Council of Baltimore, Baltimore, Md., relative to opposing the St. Lawrence seaway; to the Committee on Public Works.

601. Also, petition of Mr. J. K. Carr, and others, Daytona Beach, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2678 and 2679 known as the Townsend plan; to the committee on Ways and Means.

602. Also, petition of Pensacola Townsend Club, No. 2, Pensacola, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2678 and 2679, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 3, 1952

(Legislative day of Monday, February 25, 1952)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all mercies, in a world swept by violent forces with which, unaided, we cannot cope, Thou only art our help and our defense amid mortal woes prevailing.

Fronting the clamant duties of this new week, steady our spirits with a real-